

31c5

A N T I E N T
M E T A P H Y S I C S.
VOLUME FOURTH.
CONTAINING THE
HISTORY OF MAN.

WITH AN
APPENDIX,
RELATING TO THE
FILLE SAUVAGE
WHOM THE
AUTHOR SAW IN FRANCE.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR BELL AND BRADFUTE; AND T. CADELL, IN THE STRAND, LONDON.

M,DC,CXCV.

THE HISTORY OF

THE

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF



THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

C O N T E N T S.

PREFACE

Page i.

INTRODUCTION

p. 1

B O O K I.

The History of Man.

C H A P. I.

Of the difficulty of defining *Man*.—This difficulty arises from its being necessary to define what he is by Nature.—Aristotle the only author who has defined *Man*.—His definition explained, and the full definition given translated into English.—All the operations of the Human Mind, the animal as well as the intellectual, proceed from Comparison.—The wonderful chain of things in Nature, to be seen in the progress of the Human Mind.—This definition of man not intelligible to those who have studied only the Philosophy of Mr Locke.—The author's apology for pretending to teach a better philosophy than any that has been invented in modern times.—The propriety of defining *Man* by his comparative faculty and the capacity of intellect and science.—Nothing said of the Body of *Man* in the definition;—nor has Aristotle any where else said that he is by nature erect.—The contrary is now found to be the case.—The facts by which this is proved.—The wonderful progress of *Man*, from a quadruped to such an animal as he now is.—Of the world of art which he has created,—and made all the Powers of Nature subservient to him.

p. 11

C H A P. II.

Of the several steps of the human progression from the Brute to the *Man*.—The Author has seen three stages of that progression;—*first*, Peter the Wild Boy;—*secondly*, The Ourang Outang, of whom the Author has discovered some facts, since he published upon the subject:—*thirdly*, The Wild Girl in France.—She was an amphibious animal.—Several particulars concerning her mentioned.

p. 25

C H A P. III.

The first step that men made, in their progress to civilization, was to learn the use of their own body—*first*, By erecting themselves; *then* by learning the use of their hands;

C O N T E N T - S.

hands; and, *lastly*, to swim.—Swimming not natural to man; but his acquisitions in that way wonderful.—Till man learned the use of his own body, he could not provide sufficiently for his subsistence.—At first he lived upon the natural fruits of the earth.—These failing, he took to hunting and fishing, being able to live upon any kind of food.—But only agriculture could furnish subsistence for numbers of men, living together in close communication.—Before such an art could be invented and practised, language was necessary.

Page 35

C H A P. IV.

Of the habitation of man in the natural state.—It was in caves, which nature furnished, or which he dug out of the rocks.—This proved by the authority of antient authors—and monuments still existing.—Man as various in the form of his body, as in any thing else.—Of men with tails.—Of Satyrs, with feet of goats, and with horns upon their heads.—This proved by the testimony of *St. Jerome*.—Of men without heads, but with eyes in their breasts;—and of men with only one eye in their forehead.—These facts attested by *St. Augustine*.—Of men with the heads of dogs—proved by the testimony of several authors.—Of the Sphynx.—The existence of such an animal only attested by *Agartharchides*.—This author had a very good opportunity of being informed.—His work is extant, and bears no mark of fable or romance.—No proof that such animals did never exist, that they are not now to be found.—Reason why they should have ceased to exist.—The wonderful variety of the outward form of man, as well as of his inward form.—Of the variety of the size of men in different ages and different nations of the world.—The civilized life makes a great difference in this respect.—But there is a difference also in the natural state.—This proved by the example of the Ourang Outang.

P. 43

C H A P. V.

Of the character of man in his natural state.—Not known what his character was in the first stage of that state, when he was a quadruped;—but from what we know of the Ourang Outang, man in the second stage of his progression, is a social, friendly animal, and capable of intellect and science.—To judge of a man in the civilised state, after he has got the use of language, a distinction is to be made betwixt those who live by hunting, and those who subsist upon the fruits of the earth.—The inhabitants of the Pelew Islands a specimen of what men are in the first state of civilisation, and before they are hunters.—The wrong construction given by some men to the behaviour of the inhabitants of the Pelew Islands towards us.—The behaviour of the New Zealanders as noble and generous as that of the Pelew men.—A remarkable instance of their behaviour given.

P. 54

C H A P.

C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. VI.

Of the progress of man from a natural state, to a state of civility and arts.—Such a progress absolutely necessary.—The first step of this progress was living in herds.—Of the motives which induced men to live in that way.—Animals divided, by Aristotle, into gregarious and not gregarious;—and into political and not political.—Man of the mixed kind—both gregarious and solitary; political and not political.—Man not induced to associate by instinct, or any particular attachment to his species—proved that he has no such attachment.—It was therefore necessity or convenience that made him associate.—This the case of the Ourang Outang.—Men in that state lived like brutes, though they were both gregarious and political.—Examples of other animals living in that way.—That way of living far removed from a state of civility and arts.—Language absolutely necessary to form such a state.—Man must have formed ideas before he can have the use of speech.—Language a wonderful art, but the formation of ideas more wonderful.—The formation of ideas our first step from the mere animal life.—This is a most difficult step, being from nature, where all things are mixed with all.—The progress of ideas, from the lowest species to the highest genius.—We discover differences of things, and divide as well as unite.—Of the *Categories*, by which the whole things in the Universe are reduced to certain classes.—This the greatest discovery of philosophy that ever was made.—But the human mind goes beyond the *Categories*, and discovers what contains the *Categories*, and every thing in the Universe.—This progress most wonderful, from what is lowest in nature to what is highest.—Language necessary for that progress.—Therefore it is the parent art of all arts and sciences.

Page 60

C H A P. VII.

Of the progress of the human mind from ideas to Science.—Ideas the materials only of Science.—They must be put together in order to make science.—This done by propositions.—All propositions consist of a praedicate and a subject.—The *praedicate* the more general idea, containing the *subject* being the less general idea.—Of the manner in which one idea contains another;—and how the more general idea contains and is contained in the less general.—This explained by the distinction betwixt containing *potentially* and *actually*.—This distinction shewn to apply to all propositions, whether praedicating the genius of the species, or the accident of the substance.—Propositions alone not fit for science.—There must be that comparison of propositions, which we call *Reasoning*.—Where the connection betwixt the two Terms of the proposition is not evident, it must be made so by other propositions.—This cannot go on in *infinitum*, but must stop at self-evident propositions.—Of the process of reasoning from these

C O N T E N T S.

these propositions, and of the collection of propositions into Syllogism.—Of the wonderful invention of the Syllogism, and of the whole logical works of Aristotle.—Syllogism alone not sufficient for Science.—There must be also Definition.—Of the nature of Definition.—The terms of propositions may consist of several ideas, expressed by several words.—This illustrated by the example of the first axiom of Euclid.—Definitions, therefore, as well as Axioms, necessary for Science.—Of the utility of Logic, and the necessity that a man, who pretends to be learned in any science, should know what science is.—*Opinion* among men, prior to science or demonstration.—All men, when they first begin to think, form Opinions,—and most men never go farther. Polybius's definition of Man, *that he is an opinion-forming animal*.—This not so good a definition as Aristotle's.—Aristotle gives a system of reasoning from Popular Opinions, which he calls *Dialectics*; and with this, and his treatise *De Sophisticis Elenchis*, he concludes his great work of Logic.—Summary of this work.

Page 71

C H A P. VIII.

Of the necessity of arts and of sciences and a regular polity among Men.—Without these, men cannot be happy though associated; and in certain circumstances may be most miserable.—This proved by the example of the people of Paraguay in South America.—Of the two Authors, Charlevoix and Muratori, who give us the history of this people.—The last may be thought the more credible historian; but Charlevoix's Narrative well vouched.—The country of Paraguay of prodigious extent.—The inhabitants of it living under no government, not even the family government, except in time of war;—the most savage and brutal people we read of;—no faith or honesty among them, nor sense of the *Pulchrum* and *Honustum*;—addicted to the use of strong liquors, which made them still more barbarous;—very dull and stupid when the Jesuits came among them, but capable of being taught;—more diseased than any civilised people.—This accounted for.—Example of other men who have lived in a brutish manner, but not so brutish as the Paraguaise before they were civilised.—Of the hardships and dangers the Jesuits went through in civilising them.—Had the greatest difficulty to get at several of these nations, through deserts and forests.—Had their languages to learn;—and their Sorcerers and Magicians to encounter.—Their greatest obstacle was their apprehension of the Spaniards making Slaves of them when they were Christians.—Of the martyrdom the Jesuits suffered, to the number of 30.—Of the opposition they met with from the Spanish noblemen who governed the commaderies.—Notwithstanding all these obstacles, the Jesuits in the beginning of this century had established 30 Missions.—The greatest order and good government in all those missions.—The Jesuits did not chuse that the number

in

C O N T E N T S.

in any of their missions should exceed 6,000, as they thought great numbers could not be well governed;—were very attentive to the education of the youth, teaching them all the useful arts of life.—Nothing the Savages learnt so well as music,—learned the use of arms, and performed great actions both against the Indians and Portuguese;—not deserted by the Jesuits when in the field.—Opposition given to the arming them with fire arms.—Of the division of property among them.—No money allowed among them.—Were made most zealous Christians.—Became Apostles themselves, and suffered martyrdom.—An account of their happy state, given in a letter by the Governor of Paraguay to the King.—The love they bore to their teachers, and their teachers to them.—Of the methods by which the reformation was brought about.—*1st*, By Religion:—The Indians tamed and civilised by the Jesuits, in the same manner as the Greeks were by Orpheus.—*2^{dly}*, By Music, in the way that Amphion civilised the Greeks:—The Jesuits may also be compared to Prometheus.—*3^{tie}*, By Government the Indians were civilised.—Without government Man an imperfect animal.—Observations upon the Men of Paraguay in their wild state.—The state of civilization and government absolutely necessary to make men live in an orderly way.—The Paraguaise wanting these, and having the use of strong liquors, the wildest people that we have ever heard of.—No sense in them of the *Pulchrum* and *Honustum*, which cannot be but where there is government.—Of the diseases to which they are liable; and the reasons why they are so much diseased.—Of the difference betwixt them and the inhabitants of the Pelew Islands, and the New Zealanders.—Of the methods used by the Jesuits to civilise them; and first Religion.—This natural to man.—All men who have the least use of reason, must be convinced that beings superior to man exist:—These beings they will obey.—It was not by teaching only that the Jesuits made Christians of the Indians, but by a worship of pomp and show.—Of their processions and triumphal Arches.—A particular description of them.—Music, a great part of the Religion, to which the Indians were converted.—Of the natural power of Music over man; without it the Savages of Paraguay could not have been converted.—The last method the Jesuits used, was the establishment of a good Government among them.—This was a Religious Government.—The best Government in Antient times, such as the Heroic Government in Greece, was connected with Religion.—The story of the civilisation of these Savages, a renewal of the History of Antient times.—To be considered, whether Religion be not as necessary for continuing good Government among men, as for introducing it.—Of the dispersion of the Jesuits;—a great blow to learning;—compared to the dispersion of the Pythagorean Colleges in Magna Graecia.—Of the noviciate of 15 years, the Jesuits went through before they were admitted into the order;—were not only taught themselves but taught others;—after they were admitted, they were disposed of by the superior of the order according to their different geniuses.—Not known what is become

C O N T E N T S.

become of the Missions in Paraguay after the dissolution of the order of Jesuits.—
Their parting with their Disciples most sorrowful.—If they had not chosen to leave
them, the power of Spain could not have forced them.—Might have established ma-
ny more Missions,—and made a new Empire, and a new World of Learning in that
Country.

Page 82

B O O K II.

Of the Invention of Arts and Sciences.

C H A P. I.

The subject of this book is the invention of Arts and Sciences, beginning with the Art
of Language.—Language not natural to Man, but an Art.—Men herded, and carri-
ed on some common business before they Spoke.—Language began with animal cries,
varied perhaps by some articulation, in imitation of certain Birds;—varied also by
Musical Tones.—By such a Language no progress could have been made in Arts and
Sciences.—The Chinese Language not fit for Arts or Sciences:—These, therefore,
among them all, put into hieroglyphical writing even their law business.—A Language
of Art necessary for the invention of Arts and Sciences.—This the most difficult of
all Arts.—Proof of this.—*First* as to articulation.—This performed by the organs
of the mouth operating variously.—The first organ of speech that appears to have
been chiefly used, is the throat.—By this guttural sounds are produced, such as the
Ourang Outang uses, the Wild Girl that was seen in France, and the Huron in North
America.—Articulate sounds divided into vowels and consonants.—The nature of
these explained.—The vowels few in number, the consonants many.—The conso-
nants much more difficult in pronunciation than the vowels.—Differences from thence
accounted for, betwixt the barbarous and civilised Languages.—Another difference
betwixt the barbarous and civilised Languages, is the extraordinary length of the
words of the barbarous Languages:—This accounted for.—Of the origin of articula-
tion.—It could not have been brought to any perfection, but in a country where it
was studied and practised as an Art.—Of the progress of articulation from monosyl-
labical words to words of several syllables.—Of the variety in the sound of Language
by diphthongs;—and by vowels and consonants, aspirated and not aspirated.—Lan-
guage must have been analysed into its elemental sounds, before the sound of it could
be made so perfect.—Of the melody and rhythm of Language.—Of the expression of
ideas by Language.—These of number infinite;—but divided into certain classes or
parts of speech.—This division correspondent to the division of our ideas into Catego-

ries.

C O N T E N T S.

ries.—The number of words appear to be infinite;—made comprehensible in our memories, by the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Composition, and Flexion.—Of Syntax, and the necessity of it.—Conclusion, that Language is the greatest of all Arts.—Objection answered, That children learn to speak without Art.—Speech, though a most common thing, is very wonderful:—An account given how it is learned;—of so difficult invention, that it would have been a miracle, if Peter the Wild Boy had spoken when he was first caught, or if the Ourang Outang could speak.—Objection answered, to the Ourang Outang's being a Man, That he is the only Man, that has been found, who could not speak.—General observations upon the invention of Language.

Page 104

C H A P. II.

The Question here to be considered, is, In what country or countries was a Language of Art invented?—Language not invented by every Nation that speaks it.—This proved by the examples of the Goths, the Laplanders, and the Greenlanders.—As Language is the most Antient Art among Men, it must have been invented by a very Antient Civilised Nation.—Men must have been associated, and lived upon the natural fruits of the Earth, before Language or any other Art could have been invented. A regular Polity necessary for that purpose, and a class of Men set apart for it.—Lastly, Genius and Natural Parts required.—The Egyptian Nation, is that in which all the requisites above mentioned for the invention of Arts, concur.

p. 128

C H A P. III.

The Egyptian nation undoubtedly a very antient civilised nation.—None can pretend to be so antient, except the Indian.—A regular Government among the Egyptians in the most antient times.—This attested by Moses.—No other regular Government then known.—Of the wonderful number of Kings there according to Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, from Menes the first human King, down to Amasis.—Of the number of years these Kings reigned.—The antient history of Egypt a matter of curiosity, as well as the antient history of Greece.—Both to be considered as part of the history of *Man*.—The *second* thing required, of a country where language was to be invented, is that it should be abundant of the natural fruits of the earth.—This the case of Egypt.—The *third* thing required, is a regular government fitted for the invention and cultivation of arts.—This also in Egypt.—The *last* thing required, in a country fit for the invention of language, is that the people should have good natural parts.—This also the case of the Egyptians, as is proved by the authority of sacred and profane writers.

p. 132

VOL. IV.

b

CHAP.

C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. IV.

Of the necessity of Arts being invented in Egypt.—Other Arts mentioned as invented in Egypt, besides the Art of Language.—And, first *Agriculture*, by which only Men could subsist in the same place in considerable numbers, and so have a close communication together.—Before this Art was invented, the Egyptians ate one another; and so did the Greeks.—This Art came from Egypt to other Countries, and particularly to Attica.—The Art also of making Drink, as well as Food, for Men, invented in Egypt, viz. the Art of *Fermentation*, by which both Wine and Ale are produced.

Page 137

C H A P. V.

Of the invention of Clothes.—These not necessary in the Natural Life.—The first clothing among Men were Skins.—The country of Egypt maintaining so many Men, could not likewise maintain so many Beasts as were necessary for furnishing Skins to Cloth so many People.—Therefore Clothing by Linen invented;—also by Cloth made of Wool,—for both these Clothings, the Arts of Spinning and Weaving were necessary.—The use of Linen went from Egypt to few countries.—To the Egyptians therefore we owe not only our Bread, our Wine, and our Beer, but our Clothes.—The Egyptians must have discovered the use of Fire for the practice of those Arts.—This discovery not made by all nations in the first ages of Civility.—Of the Art of Building invented in Egypt:—Metallurgy necessary for the practice of that Art.—The Egyptians made the subject of their Art, not only every thing on the earth, and in the air and water, but what was in the bowels of the earth.—The way that Men were supplied with instruments of piercing hard substances, before the invention of Metals.—Division of Time into certain portions necessary in Civilised Life.—The first division of time into Days, that is, the interval from one rising of the Sun to his rising again.—The next portion of Time, observed by Men, was from one new Moon to another, called from thence a Month.—This the only division of Time known to barbarous nations.—The Solar Year first discovered in Egypt.—That year, as first used by the Greeks and Romans, very irregular.—The Romans got the irregularity of their year corrected from Egypt.—What was wanting to make that correction perfectly accurate, supplied by Pope Gregory *XII*.—Of the division of time into Weeks.—This invented in Egypt, and by the Egyptians carried to India.—From the Egyptians it came to Greece, and from Greece to us.

p. 144

CHAP.

C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. VI.

Of Religion, and the necessity of it to constitute and carry on a good polity.—The opinion of Mr David Hume upon this subject, very different from that of Cicero.—Religion not known to *Man* in his natural state,—nor in the first age of civility.—This proved, first by *Reason*, and then by *Facts*,—and first as to *Reason*.—It shews that *Man* in the natural state can have no ideas at all; and, in the beginning of civility, only ideas of corporeal substances,—but no ideas of invisible powers acting upon body, without which there can be no idea of God.—This idea only to be acquired in process of time after the invention of different arts.—Secondly as to *Facts*; it is proved by the example of the Ourang Outang,—Peter the Wild Boy,—the Wild Girl in France,—the people of the Pelew Islands,—those of New Zealand—of New Holland, and particularly of Botany Bay.—Objection answered, from the example of the Indians of North America, who have got the notion of a great spirit.—This they must have got from a people farther advanced in arts and civility, who are proved by monuments still existing to have been once in that country.—That the idea of a God is not an innate idea; no innate ideas of any kind.

Page 150

C H A P. VII.

Impossible that the Egyptians, who had invented so many arts and sciences, should not have been Religious.—They were the most Religious of all Nations.—Religion here considered as a Political Institution, which produced no bad effects among the Egyptians, as it has done in many other Nations.—If it produced no bad effects, where there was so much of it as in Egypt, it must have produced good effects.—Difference betwixt the Religion of Egypt and that of other Countries.—In other Countries the Gods only predicted events; in Egypt they were Kings, and Governed.—Of the nature of the Egyptian Gods.—They were embodied, were born, and died; and were of different Characters.—They were of that class of Beings called *Dæmons*.—This opinion supported by the authority of Plutarch, Plato, and other Authors quoted by him.—Proved from theory that such Beings as *Dæmons* must exist, otherwise there would be a void in the universe, which cannot be supposed to be in so perfect a System.—Agreeable to the wisdom and goodness of God, that such Beings should be sent among men, to assist them to recover from their fallen State, by teaching them Arts and Sciences.—This was done by the *Dæmons* in Egypt.—This happened in other countries as well as in Egypt, particularly in China and Peru.—In Peru there was an Osiris and an Isis, under the name of Manco Capac and his Sister-wife.—Authorities from Scripture to prove the existence of *Dæmons*.—They may be sup-

C O N T E N T S.

posed to have been the Beings called, in Scripture, Angels, who had the superintendency of human affairs.—Each Nation had its Angel.—A bad translation of a text on this subject in our Bible.—*The Sons of God*, who, we are told, copulated with the Daughters of Men, must have been Dæmons.—This interpretation of the text supported by the authority of the Fathers of the Church.—It was natural that those Dæmons in Egypt should be the objects of Popular Worship there;—but the learned Egyptians made a distinction betwixt the Popular Religion and the Religion of Philosophers.—Proof of this from their knowing the doctrine of the Trinity.—A great deal of Rites, Ceremonies, and Pomp in the Popular Religion of Egypt.—The same in the Religion of Greece and Rome;—also in the Religions of the Jews.—Proof of this from Scripture.—Music a considerable part of the Religion of all Antient Nations;—very much attended to by the Egyptians.—The Antient Music among them carefully preserved.—Of the Oracles in Egypt.—By them only the Egyptians divined.—From them Oracles came to Greece, but not to the Romans, who divined only by the Flight of Birds and Entrails of Beasts.—Of the Egyptian Oracles.—These were given by the Dæmons who had Reigned over them;—difference in that respect betwixt the Oracles of Egypt and of Greece, as well as betwixt the Gods of Egypt and of Greece.—Of the deceit and imposture of the Greek Oracles.—Of the Sacred Animals among the Egyptians.—These were types of their Divinities.—Better representations of Divinity than any thing inanimate, such as Brass or Stone.—By means of these Sacred Animals, the Egyptians lived with their Gods, more than any other People;—and were the most Religious of all People;—and also the Happiest.—Observations upon the difference betwixt the Religion of the Philosopher and the Vulgar.—A Religion of contemplation, such as that of the Philosopher, not fit for an uninstrusted Mind.

Page 155

C H A P. VIII.

Of Government, and the general Principles upon which it must be founded.—Of the importance of Government,—without it there could have been no arts or sciences among Men; nor of consequence any Religion.—Even Religion without Government could not have made men happy.—Therefore Government a most important part of the history of man.—Men first lived in herds,—then in families.—Examples of men living in that way in antient times, and even at this day.—Of the Union of families, States were formed.—There Government became necessary.—Every State must consist of the Governors and the Governed.—It is nature that must fit men to govern or to be governed.—The Greek Philosophers have said too little of *nature*, and seem to have supposed that *education* in the matter of Government was every thing:—Of the difference of men by nature,—some fit to govern, and some fit to be governed.—Of Heliod's division of men:—The first class of that division only fit to be governors.

C O N T E N T S.

governors.—These must be very few in every nation.—The excellency of the species, *Man*, confined to a few races, like that of other specieses.—The two other classes of men fit only to be governed, but in different ways.—No education can make men fit to govern, who by nature are not qualified:—How it was first discovered that men by nature were so qualified.—It was by the look, the figure, and the size.—In this way men were distinguished in the herds;—and still more in the societies formed of families,—of these were the first founders of States and Rulers.—This proved by the example of the first States of Greece.—No States could have been constituted without such men.—The description of such men by Homer.—Of the heroic Kings in Greece.—These not Dæmons, like the first Egyptian Kings, but mere men that came from Crete or Egypt.—Of the heroic form of Government,—of the qualifications necessary for the governor of such a state.—The same form of Government among the Indians of North America.—Observations upon the necessity of eloquence for carrying on a free Government.—The antient heroic Kings excelled in that art.—The account of those Kings given by Homer, an important part in the history of man.—They were the noblest race of men that ever existed.—No exaggeration by Homer in their characters and manners;—all those heroes of noble birth.—The value of horses depends upon their birth.—No distinction betwixt men and horses in that respect.—In later times, the distinction of birth observed, particularly among the Athenians and the Romans.—The bad consequences of the neglect of that distinction, particularly among the Romans.—The same distinction of birth observed in modern times, particularly in the Knights of Malta.—No distinction of races of men now, as there was in the heroic times.—Of the degeneracy of the best races of men by impure mixtures, and by an improper education and manner of life.—Example of one heroic race being preserved by living in a proper way.—The Government in Rome under the Kings, the same with the heroical Government.—Better under one King than two Consuls.—Of the defect of the heroic Governments in giving so much power to the people.—The consequence of that in Athens and in Rome.—Another objection to this heroical Government is, that it was not fitted for the improvement of arts and sciences.—These defects remedied in the Government of Egypt.

Page 173

C H A P. IX.

The question to be considered is, Which is the best form of government among men?

—That the democratical is the worst, the author supposes in the preceding chapter.

—That it is so, proved *a priori*, from the nature of man and of government:—

Proved also by fact and experience;—particularly by the example of the Athenians, a people, the clearest that perhaps ever existed; yet they could not govern themselves.—When they ceased to be governed by the laws which Solon gave them, or

by

C O N T E N T S.

by eminent men, that got the lead among them, their affairs went into the greatest disorder, and their State was ruined.—Their seizing the public money, and applying it to their maintainance and pleasures, one of the chief causes of their ruin.—This made them live an indolent and pleasurable life, which made them unfit for the great wars, wherein they engaged—of their losses in the Peloponnesian war,—which had like to have ended in the total destruction of their city.—By the peace which they were forced to make, they were subjected to thirty tyrants.—One chief reason of their ill success in the war, was their suspicion of all the men of eminence among them,—which made them practice that extraordinary form of process called Ostracism.—Example of that in the case of Aristides.—They might perhaps have taken Syracuse, if they had not recalled Alcibiades from that expedition.—Their reason for recalling him, a most frivolous one.—The administration of their affairs at Rome in some instances accompanied with the greatest injustice,—an example of this in the condemnation and execution of fourteen of their sea commanders, who had obtained for them a single victory.—Their democratical form of government corrupted their manners,—and made them a people quite different from their ancestors.—Their government a most compleat democracy, where *Liberty and Equality* were in the highest perfection.—No other example necessary to prove how bad a government democracy is, than the example of France before our eyes;—more folly, madness, and crimes, committed under that government by the French, than there is any example of in any other nation in the same short space of time.—Monarchy, the best form of government.—It is the government of the Universe, and the first government among men—so much founded in nature, that it takes place occasionally even in constitutions of which it is no part,—as in the case of the Dictator among the Romans.—Of the perpetual Dictator in Rome, and then of their Emperors.—One essential difference betwixt the democratical and monarchical governments, that the democratical never can be a good government, but the monarchical, though not restrained by laws, may be a good government;—two chances for that, if the King be a good King, or his Minister a good Minister.—The particular happiness of Britain is to have both good.—Nothing can make men desirous of a change of such a government, but the infection of the French madness;—proper means used to prevent that. Page 188

C H A P. X.

Of the government of Egypt.—That government very antient,—as antient as the days of Joseph;—no other regular government then on earth, except in India:—But that government derived from Egypt.—All governments consist of the governors and the governed.—Of the governors in Egypt.—The government there monarchical, which the Egyptians thought the best government.—The King in Egypt had only the executive power.—A higher class of men were his Counsellors.—To them were intrusted

C O N T E N T S.

ed the religion of the country, and arts and sciences.—The excellency of every man, in every art and science, must depend upon his natural genius and his education,—of these two the first is principal.—Nature must lay the foundation of excelling in all arts.—Of the difference betwixt the philosophy of the Egyptians and that of the Greek philosophers, as to the natural distinction of men.—The Greek philosophers thought that education alone was sufficient to make a good governing man.—The Priests of Egypt were the governing men there.—The name which they gave themselves:—They were kept quite distinct from the rest of the people,—had the custody of religion, and the care of arts and sciences.—These two necessarily connected.—Without having cultivated his intellectual faculties, no man can have a just idea of supreme intelligence.—The reason for this.—Further proofs that there is a natural difference of men.—A great distinction of men in India in antient times.—This is still to be seen there.—This distinction of men every where to be found,—even in the new discovered World in the South Sea.—No doctrine more absurd than that of the natural equality of men.—The most pernicious doctrine when applied to government.—Other classes of men in Egypt, set apart and distinguished from the rest.—And first the military class.—Some observations upon that class.—They belong to the 2d order of men mentioned by Hesiod.—The other classes consist of men who are necessary in every state, being such as provide the necessaries of life for the people.—Difference betwixt Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, as to the division of them.—To make the distinction of men among the inferior classes, a matter of great difficulty.—It was the work of the Dæmon Kings in Egypt, who formed the polity of Egypt.—This polity formed before the expedition of Osiris into India,—not the work of any of the human Kings.—Providence interposed to promote the progress of men towards their recovery from their fallen state, by the improvement of their intellectual faculties.—This he did among the Jews, to whom he gave a law and constitution, by his Angels and by Moses. This he did also in Egypt, but not in so signal manner, as among the Jews.—It was proper that a difference should be made betwixt the two nations.—Of the education in Egypt.—There the best education possible; for it was domestic,—all arts and sciences there hereditary, and continually increasing from generation to generation.—This education compared with the education among us, and the education among the Greeks and Romans.—Nature and Education never separated among the Egyptians.—Where that separation is made, the characters of men can never be perfect.—Of the manner of living of the Egyptian Priests.—This too qualified them to excel in arts and sciences.—In this likewise very different from men of science in other countries.—It was therefore necessary, that they should excel the Greeks and every other nation in arts and philosophy.—The Egyptians had not among them the arts of poetry and rhetoric.—Nor did they cultivate music so much as the Greeks did, as it was no art of pleasure among them.—

Sculpture

C O N T E N T S.

Sculpture and painting practised among the Egyptians, but more cultivated among the Greeks.—The Greek genius, particularly suited for the fine arts.—Of the election of the Kings in Egypt.—The Priests there were electors,—but had not so great power over the Kings, as the Priests of Ethiopia had, though the Egyptians were a colony of Ethiopians, and though there was a great similarity of customs and manners in the two nations.—Of the division of land in Egypt.

Page 201

C H A P. XI.

Observations to prove that the Egyptian form of government was most perfect.—The Egyptian government had not the fault of the heroic governments, nor of the later governments in Greece, that of being too popular.—The consequence of a popular government is, giving power to men who can neither give nor take good council.—The government of Egypt had not another defect of the heroic governments in Greece, viz. that it was not fit for the cultivation of arts and sciences.—Leisure required for that, and a class of men set apart for that purpose.—This the Priests of Egypt had.—Antient learning never could have been restored in Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries, if men had not been set apart for that purpose.—Objection to the Egyptian government, that it was not a free government, such as the heroic governments.—Answer, that it was not a popular government, and so much the better for not being such;—reason for this.—Objection, that the people in Egypt were governed like slaves.—Answer, that they were so wise, as to submit willingly to the government established among them, and not to obey through fear or by compulsion.—This was the case of the Capadocians of old, and the Peasants at present in Poland and Russia.—The consequences of the people being taken from their private business to attend the Public, is their poverty.—Examples of this in Athens and Rome.—They will desire to make profit of the Public; and that will produce faction and corruption.—No Slaves in Egypt.—That proved by the silence of Antient authors upon that subject, and by the present practice in India.—Sesostris did not make Slaves of his Captives, but employed them in public works.—Slavery, an impolitical institution, —not necessary in Egypt, as it was in Greece and Rome.—No indigence in Egypt, such as in modern Nations, and was in antient times.—No money there.—Commerce carried on by exchange.—No great estates.—That prevented by the Agrarian law, dividing the land among three orders of the State.—No foreign luxury in Egypt, as they had no trade with other countries.—A singular thing in the History of Egypt, that they made no Provinces of the Countries they conquered,—nor imposed any tribute upon them.—The Egyptians, not only happy themselves, but a public blessing to mankind, by importing arts and civility among them.—The three great articles of the political system, are the health, the morals, and the numbers of the people.

C O N T E N T S.

ple.—As to health, the Egyptians the healthiest of all civilised nations;—used Physic, not only to cure diseases, but to prevent them.—As to morals—these better in Egypt than in other countries, because they were the most religious of men,—and had not those temptations to vice, which other nations have by wealth and by indigence.—Land their only property; which could not be accumulated in the hands of individuals.—As to numbers, these were wonderful in Egypt.—A particular account of the number of Cities under Amasis and Ptolemy Lagus.—This number of Cities more to be depended on than the numbering of Men.—Reasons given for the wonderful increase of Men in Egypt.—All marrying, and having children.—All children brought up at the smallest expence.—And children not dying under age, as so many die among us.—One extraordinary reason for the increase of people, was the addition to the country of the *Delta*.—This must have added very much to the numbers of the people, as well as to the increase of learning.—The Egyptian Government thus proved to be the best that ever existed; and the most fitted for the cultivation of arts and sciences.—The duration of the Government of Egypt, a proof of its excellency.—No changes made in it during a prodigious number of years.—No disputes about the succession to the Crown, till the Greeks came among them.—The Ethiopian Kings to be considered as of the same country.—Proof of the perfection of the Government of Egypt, is the duration of the same Government in India, notwithstanding all the conquests that have been made in that country.—People in India divided in the same manner as in Egypt.—The Hindoos of India, a very happy people.—Antient Egypt to be considered as preserved in India.

Page 220

C H A P. XII.

Comparison of the present State of Egypt with its antient State.—The change more for the worse than in any other country.—In Herodotus's time, it was a country more wonderful than all the other countries upon the earth.—Of its climate, and its river.—The climate not liable to excess either of hot or cold, dry or wet.—The changes of these produce many diseases among men.—The river more wonderful than the climate.—It has created a country in Egypt,—and makes this country wonderfully fruitful by renewing the soil of it.—Without that, the land of Egypt could not have lasted or maintained so many people.—Examples to prove this.—The Nile made agriculture in Egypt a very easy art, which is so laborious in other countries.—It delivered them from the reproach of feeding upon dung.—The river, besides, yielded many plants of different kinds, upon which the inhabitants of the marshy part of Egypt lived.—The land of Egypt fertile as well as the water.—It produced wheat and barley which grew wild there, and no where else.—Of the works of art in Egypt.—The *first* and greatest work of that kind, the mounds of earth, upon which

C O N T E N T S.

the cities were built, and without which the country could not have been inhabited.—The *second* great work of art in Egypt, was the Lake of Mæris;—a most useful work, —of wonderful circumference and depth.—The *third* great work of Egypt, was the Labyrinth.—The *fourth*, the Pyramids,—the *last* of the great works of Egypt, as Herodotus has arranged them, but such, that, if they had not been still extant, we could not have believed in the other wonders of Egypt.—The greatest work of art among the Egyptians, was their Government,—the subject of which was *Men*, and not materials such as stone and brick.—In this they exceeded all the world.—All these arts, joined with their prodigious numbers, and the arts and sciences they invented, make them the most wonderful people on earth.—Of the present state of Egypt,—wonderfully changed for the worse,—first, as to the numbers of the people.—The antient Egyptian Race not to be found in Egypt:—So that the nation may be said to be annihilated.—Instead of being the most fruitful country in the world, not able to maintain the few inhabitants that are in it: And, instead of being the healthiest country in the world, it is now the seat of disease.

Page 245

C H A P. XIII.

Recapitulation of what has been said in the former chapter.—The subject of the origin of the arts and sciences continued.—The art of government invented in Egypt, and brought to perfection.—Of the necessary arts of life there invented.—Language also will be shown to have been there invented.—The use of fire discovered in Egypt;—and the use of it in making glass, which was unknown to the Greeks and Romans.—Glass coloured like precious stones, also known to them;—likewise the hatching of chickens without incubation.—Of the art of music:—It was practised in Egypt for the best purposes:—As it was practised there, it was also there invented.—The practice of it very antient in Egypt.—It was invented under the Dæmon Kings,—and was preserved with the greatest care, and no innovation of it suffered.—For this purpose, there must have been a notation of it.—An art of music of very difficult invention, being the application of numbers to the tones of the human voice or of instruments, —a short account given of the difficulty of the invention.—It could only have been invented in a country such as Egypt, where arts and sciences were cultivated.—The Greek music no better than the music of the Hurons, till Pythagoras brought the art into Greece from Egypt.—From thence they only got the Diatonic Scale.—To this they added the Chromatic and the Enharmonic.—This refinement of music not so proper for the useful purposes to which the Egyptians applied it.—The Greeks had also modes of music, such as the Dorian, the Phrygian, and Lydian.—The writing art more connected with language than music.—It is language not pronounced.—A wonderful art, by which sounds are made visible,—a progress in the writing art as in every

C O N T E N T S.

every other.—At first, the ideas were directly represented, by figures natural or symbolical.—These last were what is called Hieroglyphics.—Of the assistance given to our intellect by our senses, and how wonderfully the two concur to carry on man in the pursuit of knowledge.—The advantages of the writing art.—This art invented in Egypt by a Dæmon, called Theuth.—But he invented only the notation of the elemental sounds by written characters.—The analysis of language, into elemental sounds, was before his time, under the Dæmon Kings.

Page 254

C H A P. XIV.

Of the difficulty of the invention of Language.—The forming of ideas, necessarily previous to the invention of Language; as there can be no Language, which has only names for individual things.—Of the difference betwixt Particular and General Ideas:—Abstract and General Ideas not the same.—Of the material part of Language, Articulation;—of wonderful difficult invention.—Nature has furnished the materials, with which other arts work; but we have created the materials of Language.—Wonderful, that we should have learned to articulate by any practice.—Speaking the most wonderful thing among Men.—As Men speak by imitation, they must have been taught to speak.—This could not be done by Men such as we,—but they must have had supernatural assistance, and been taught by Dæmons.—A Language of Art could not have been formed without Men having made some progress in other Arts and Sciences.—This could not be without some kind of Language being used before a Language of Art was formed.—The formal part of Language, a most wonderful part of the Art.—There must be words in a Language of Art, to express every thing in the World of Nature and the World of Art, Immaterial things as well as Material.—Each individual thing impossible to be expressed,—only the species of them can be expressed.—These so many, that they could not be all expressed by words unconnected with one another.—But they are connected together by the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Composition, and Flexion.—Of these three, the greatest Art is *Flexion*.—An example of the Art of it in the Verb.—To a Language that is perfect is joined the pleasant Art of Music, consisting of Melody and Rhythm.—This common to several of the Antient Languages, and to some Modern Languages.—Of the difference betwixt the Music of the Chinese Language and that of the Greek.—The one is Chanting or Singing; the other of a fine Melodious flow, suitable to Language, and quite different from common Music.—Language thus shown to be a most beautiful as well as useful Art, and of the greatest extent, variety, and, at the same time, regularity.

p. 264

C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. XV.

Reasons for the Author insisting so much upon the difficulty of the invention of the Art of Language.—One reason is, that it tends to prove, that Language must have been invented in Egypt, where so many other arts were invented.—Proved, *1mo*, That Language was invented by the Egyptians, by the progress they made in other arts and in sciences, which could not have been without Language.—*2dly*, Articulation could not have been invented without the assistance of those Dæmon Kings, whom the Egyptians had.—*3tio*, We are sure that the Egyptians made the first step in the invention of an art of Language, by analysing it into its elemental sounds.—They did not stop at that analysis, but likewise analysed the words into the parts of speech.—But these words at first monosyllabical.—In this state Language went to China, where it remains unimproved, in its original state.—Hieroglyphics went there also;—and there they are still preserved.—In Egypt the art was perfected by the invention of the Alphabet, and of a Polysyllabical Language, formed by Derivation, Composition, and Flexion.—This completed the Grammatical Art, and the Art of Language.—The Phœnicians the only people that can contend with the Egyptians for the invention of Language.—Sundry reasons given why they were not the inventors of it.—*1mo*, Their Genius did not lead them that way, being wholly employed in Trade, and studious only of Gain.—*2dly*, They had no Polity fit for the invention or cultivation of arts.—*3tio*, They lived, in antient times, in the neighbourhood of the Egyptians, and so may be supposed to have got Language and other arts from them.—*4to*, They had their Religion from Egypt.—This proved by sundry facts.—The Egyptians, therefore, the inventors, and the only inventors of Language.—How Language and other arts were transmitted from Egypt to other Countries, is an important part of the History of Man:—This to be treated of in the following Book. Page 273

B O O K III.

Of the Transmission of Arts and Sciences from Egypt to other Countries.

C H A P. I.

Egypt so situated as to be fit for communicating its Arts to many countries of the Earth.—It communicated by land with Africa and Asia.—In Africa their Arts do not appear

C O N T E N T S.

pear to have made any great progress.—The Lybians quite a Savage People.—They spoke a very barbarous Language, which they may have formed from hearing the Egyptian Language spoken.—To Asia the Egyptian Language and Arts may have been carried by Sesostris, who overran even the northern parts of Asia, and established a colony at Colchis upon the Euxine Sea.—The Jews learned their Language from Egypt,—but it was a corrupt dialect of the Egyptian which they spoke.—This proved from what passed in Egypt when Jacob and his family came there.—They learned also the writing Art in Egypt, and wrote like the Egyptians from right to left.—From Chaldaea the Egyptian Language proceeded to other parts of Asia.—The Art of Language, though of more difficult invention than any other Art, is of very easy communication.—Of the progress of the Egyptian Arts from Egypt to Europe.—Sesostris, from Colchis, might have gone by land to Thrace, where he was.—But the easier and shorter passage from Egypt to Europe was by Sea.—Of Navigation the Egyptians had the use in the earliest times.—The nearest Island in the Mediterranean Sea to Egypt was Crete.—Thither the Egyptian Arts first went, being introduced by the *Idæi Dactyle* and the *Curetes*.—That Religion came from Egypt to Crete, proved by the Samothracian and Eleusinian Myteries, being well known there.—Saturn the first King of Crete, being dethroned by his Son Jupiter, carried from thence the Egyptian Arts to Italy, and made a Saturnian age there.—Jupiter ruled in Greece as well as in Crete,—introduced there the Egyptian Arts.—These Arts brought into Greece more directly by Colonies from Egypt.—The necessity of Migration from so small a Country as Egypt, and so populous.—Of the two Colonies which came from Egypt, and formed the nations of Athenians and Arcadians:—These the two most antient nations of Greece.—From Arcadia came a Colony under Oenotrus, that settled in Italy, and another under Evander.—From Arcadia came the Pelasgi, who introduced a great deal of Civility and Arts into Greece, particularly the Writing Art:—But the Egyptians carried their Arts to a Country very remote, viz. India.—This the subject of another chapter.

Page 280

C H A P. II.

The similarity of Polity, Customs, and Manners, betwixt nations so remote as Egypt and India, wonderful, and without example,—not to be found even in nations contiguous.—The first resemblance is, in a thing singular to both nations,—viz. the division of the people into classes, according to their several occupations.—This division in India, more accurate and minute than in Egypt.—Another singularity in which the two nations agree is, the veneration of the Cow.—Of the division of Time into Months and Years;—the same in India as it was in Egypt, and is among us.—The division into Weeks not necessary for any purposes of life, yet observed both in India and

C O N T E N T S.

and Egypt.—The days also consecrated to the same planets and in the same order.—The conformity betwixt the two nations, as to the signs of the Zodiac, most extraordinary.—Of the Religion of India.—The same distinction made there, betwixt the Popular Religion of the country and the Religion of Philosophers.—The fall of man maintained by the Indians, and a future state of rewards and punishments,—also the doctrine of the transmigration of minds, which came originally from Egypt.—The diet and manner of life of the Indians, the same as in antient Egypt.—They eat no flesh, but of the beasts which they sacrifice.—They drink no wine or strong liquors; and neither did the Egyptians in very antient times.—The same regard for the animal life in India as in Egypt.—The killing of some animals was a capital crime in Egypt, and is so in India.—There a mulct is imposed for the killing of any animal, even Tygers.—A resemblance betwixt the two nations also in their festivals, and exhibitions on those occasions.

Page 288

C H A P. III.

The conformity in so many particulars, betwixt Egypt and India, could not have been by accident,—nor could each of these nations have been the original inventors.—The one must have copied from the other.—The question then, Which was the original, which the copy?—No third nation, from which these two nations could have taken their institutions and customs,—such a conformity could not have been produced in the ordinary way of commerce.—The two nations, therefore, must have mixed and lived together for some time.—The Indians did not go to Egypt.—Therefore the Egyptians came to India.—This proved not by argument only, but by facts;—a particular account given by Diodorus of the expedition to India by Osiris,—also of that of Sesostris to the same country.—Both these expeditions by land.—But Sesostris was not the first Egyptian King that went to India.—This attested not only by the sacred books of the Egyptians, but by tradition preserved among the most learned of the Indians.—In that tradition a memorable story preserved, of Osiris having saved his army from a pestilential disease by carrying it to a hill called *Mezer*.—Hence the Greek fable.—Summary of the evidence of Osiris having gone to India.—Objection to the account of Osiris's expedition, that Herodotus says nothing of it.—This answered.—The tradition also mentions that Hercules was in India, and clothes and arms him very properly.—The absurdity of the Greek fable, concerning the cloathing and armour of Hercules.—Memorials of Osiris in India, to be seen in the days of Alexander, and even of Diodorus Siculus.—Strabo did not believe in the expedition of Osiris.—A reason given for that.—The Egyptians could not go to India to learn civility and arts;—these they must have had before,—and the Indians must have learned them from them.—This proved by monuments of black men, with woolly hair,

C O N T E N T S.

hair, to be seen in India; and also in China and Japan.—Proof that the Egyptian Religion, as well as arts, was carried to all the countries of the East as well as to India.—Language also carried from Egypt to India,—a language of art, the work of science and philosophy; in which analysis is very much practised. Page 295

C H A P. IV.

The Egyptians must have had the use of a Language of Art before they could have invented so many Arts and Sciences, as it is proved they did invent.—This Language they must have invented themselves, or got from some other country;—no other country but Egypt, where it could have been invented.—The Phœnicians could not have been the inventors of a Language of Art, for reasons which are given.—The question is, Whether Osiris carried to India the Language of Egypt, as well as its other arts?—If the language of India were a barbarous language, it could not be supposed to have come from Egypt.—But the Shanfcrit, the original language of India, a language of the greatest art.—This proved by the testimony of Sir William Jones, and of Brasseley Halhed.—It excels in the three great arts of Language, Derivation, Composition, and Flexion, and particularly in the last.—In the pronunciation it has both Melody and Rhythm;—and its Poetry is formed by short and long syllables;—A specimen of that Poetry given by Brasseley Halhed.—In that specimen, the words are of great length, and full of vowels.—Their alphabet consists of 50 letters. The long and short vowels marked by different characters.—The author learned more of the Shanfcrit language from Mr Wilkins than he has learned any other way. Mr Wilkins has proved by fact, what the author thought could only be proved by argument, that the Shanfcrit was the Egyptian language imported into India by Osiris.—This proved by comparing the Greek with the Shanfcrit.—General reflections on the transmission of languages from one country to another, and the changes thereby made in the languages.—And, *first*, as to the pronunciation.—That changes in the same nation; but much more when a language is carried to a different nation, and that nation at a great distance.—*2dly*, As to the sense of the words.—This changed, too, by the language going to a different country.—Examples of derivative languages much changed from the original;—such as the Italian, French, and Spanish, and the dialects of the Gothic.—Though these languages did not travel far, yet so changed as not to be intelligible, though one understands the parent language:—So different also from one another, that the understanding of one will not make you understand another.—The change must have been much greater in the antient Egyptian language, when it travelled as far as India, and was introduced among a people so barbarous as the Indians then were.—As it is spoken by the common people there, it is not to be known for the language of antient Egypt, but preserved among the Bramins.

C O N T E N T S.

Bramins.—Another observation upon the passage of language from one country to another.—The pronunciation must be very much changed, particularly of the vowels;—also of the consonants.—Words of the same sound do not prove two languages to be the same,—not even if they be of the same sense likewise, unless there be many of them, or words that must have been original in all languages.—A conformity betwixt two languages in the three great arts of Language, Composition, Derivation, and Flexion, the surest proof of their being originally the same language.—The names of numbers, and of members of the human body, and of relations, must be original words in all languages.—1st, Of the names of numbers.—These in Sanscrit the same as in Greek and Latin.—Some anomalies in these numbers of the Sanscrit, and the same in Greek and Latin.—The names of the members of the human body the same in Sanscrit as in Greek and Latin,—also the names of Relations.—The name of God in Sanscrit, the same as in Greek and Latin,—many words of the Sanscrit more Latin than Greek.—Instances of that.—A difference in the sound of the words in Sanscrit, and in Greek, and Latin.—This accounted for, from the great changes in the pronunciation of language.—Of Greek names of places and persons in India, when Alexander was there,—these names more Greek than the present Sanscrit.—The reason of this.—A great many more Greek words to be collected from the Sanscrit.—Mr Wilkins has given the author about 70 more.—Other words he has got from other travellers in India.—Of the resemblance of the two languages in the three great arts of Language, Composition, Derivation, and Flexion.—Examples of composition in the Sanscrit.—One extraordinary composition, with the *A privative*, as common in the Sanscrit as in the Greek.—Of derivation in the Sanscrit, Mr Wilkins has given the author no example,—but it is used in that language as well as composition and flexion.—Of flexion in the Sanscrit.—The great variety of this art of language.—Verbs in μ , in the Sanscrit as well as in the Greek,—a specimen of four persons of the present tense of the substantive verb in the Sanscrit, the same with the Greek and Latin.—Mr Wilkins, by comparing the two languages, has proved that in fact the two languages are the same,—has settled, in this way, a fact which was denied by some antient authors, that the Egyptians were in India.—The learned world thereby much obliged to him.

Page 318

C H A P. V.

The Language imported by Osiris into India is still preserved under the name of the Sanscrit.—It is the Sacred Language of India; now understood only by the Bramins.—It is to be presumed, that the Language of Egypt, as it went as far as India, went also to the neighbouring countries.—But, besides presumption, there is proof from facts.—This furnished by M. Gebelin in his *Monde Primitif*.—He, and Bullet in

C O N T E N T S.

in his Celtic Dictionary, maintain, that there was a primitive Language, from which all the other Languages on earth are derived.—That such a Language did exist, M. Gebelin has proved, by comparing the several Languages in the world with one another,—the European, Asiatic, and American, Languages compared together by him.—America peopled from the north east parts of Asia.—A curious fact related of a singular custom of the Egyptians which the Americans have adopted.—The method which M. Gebelin has followed in making this comparison, very proper, by finding out the radical words in the several Languages.—Of the difference of sound of derivative words from their radicals in the same Language; but this difference much greater in different dialects of that Language.—An exact account, digested into tables, given by Gebelin, of the changes of derivative words from the original.—The change of vowels in the derivative Languages, not so great as of consonants:—The reason for this.—But consonants also changed.—This makes the difference so great betwixt the original and derivative Languages.—Of the monosyllables of the Chinese Language; many of them to be found in other Languages, and particularly in the Coptic.—Thus proved, that there was a time when there was only one Language on the face of the earth.—The author, before he read M. Gebelin, was of another opinion.—What that Language was M. Gebelin has not determined.—All the Languages of Europe, he says, are derived from the Celtic.—But the Celts did not invent their Language, nor the Goths theirs.—The Gothic a more perfect Language in some respect than the Latin.—Any nation speaking a language of art, only proves that the original Language came to them in greater perfection than to other nations.—The resemblance betwixt the Celtic and other Languages, no proof that these Languages are derived from the Celtic.—The Greek Language was certainly not derived from the Celtic, but came directly from Egypt.—If the Greeks did not invent their Language, how can we suppose that the Celts or Goths did.—The progress of the formation of the Language of art, in Egypt, must have begun with words of one syllable.—In that way the Chinese monosyllabic Language is to be accounted for.—These monosyllabical words were the roots of the primitive Language.—A great question, By what rule, or whether by any rule, these roots were formed?—The letters, according to M. Gebelin, are to be considered as a kind of roots.—The Author's opinion in this matter:—Nothing, even among men, done without some reason.—Many words formed from the sound.—Even ideas may be expressed by a sound, which is supposed to have some analogy to them.—The Sanscrit, according to Father Pons, a most wonderful piece of art and science.—It analyses the particular ideas, expressed by the words, into the general ideas from which they arise.—These expressed by monosyllables, which are the roots of the Language.—Monosyllables being the simplest words are the fittest for Derivation and Composition.—From these roots, in long order and with great variety, are deduced, according to fixed and de-

C O N T E N T S.

terminate rules, the words of the Sanscrit, expressing the particular ideas, falling under the general ideas denoted by the roots.—Examples of this given by Pons the Jesuit:—a knowledge of the roots, and of the Grammar of the Language, together with the rules of derivation and composition, will enable a person to form a Language of his own, which will be understood by those who know the art by which the Language is formed.—The Jesuit Pons's account, of this Language, confirmed by Mr Wilkins.—This Language the work of philosophers.—It may be compared to the *Categories* of Archytas.—The Greek and Latin, though not so perfect as the Sanscrit, wonderful works of art,—connecting, by means of Derivation, Composition, and Flexion, some millions of words.—Flexion the greatest of these.—Its wonderful effects in nouns and verbs.—In the Greek verb upwards of a thousand variations.—M. Gebelin, though learned in Languages, knew so little of the philosophy of Language, as to maintain that men speak naturally, and have from nature the ideas they express by the words.—According to him, two persons meeting, who had learned no Language, would hold communication together by speech, and understand one another.—This the primitive Language of Gebelin:—According to him, all other arts, as well as Language, natural to men; and they have from the beginning the knowledge of astronomy, and of all the arts of life.—No natural state according to Gebelin, the Savages, at present to be found, being men degenerated.—The Author's system, from ancient books, very different from Gebelin's;—though an admirer of Greek learning, and a reader of many books in that Language, M. Gebelin has not read their philosophers, who would have taught him the progress of man from *capacity* to *energy*.—Without Greek philosophy, no natural talents or application will avail.—Contradiction in Gebelin's system;—it is refuted by the fact, of deaf persons being likewise dumb, and being taught to speak with great labour and much difficulty.—Even the most barbarous Language a work of art, if the words express all the ideas of the speaker, and are connected together.—Men, in the natural state, without the use of speech, are in the case of dumb men;—They could not teach themselves:—But the Dæmon Kings of Egypt, who invented Language, must first have taught themselves, and then others.—Progress of the art even in Egypt.—The first words there monosyllables.—The Language in that state went to China:—When a Language of words of several syllables was invented, these monosyllables were made the roots of the Language.—In this way the Sanscrit was formed.—But the Chinese have preserved the Language, in monosyllables, as they got it.—The great imperfection of that Language.—The question, In what country Gebelin's primitive Language was invented?—It could be no where but in Egypt, where the Dæmon Kings reigned.—The Jews had no Language revealed to them,—no country in such a state of civility, when Osiris went to India, that they could have invented the most barbarous Language.—Of the way the Egyptian Language was communicated to other nations,

C O N T E N T S.

nations, and how it came to be so barbarous as it was spoken by some nations.—It was conveyed to India by Osiris, and by him deposited in the hands of the Bramins, who have preserved it with little or no corruption, but have not improved it.—It also went to Greece, but not in so great purity as to India,—was preserved there by Homer and the other poets.—Next to the Greek Language, it is in the greatest purity in the Celtic.—This proved by its resemblance to the Latin,—and by the name of *Sanscrit* being a Celtic word.—Surprising that in some of the most barbarous Languages, a good deal of the art of the antient Egyptian Language should be preserved,—as in the Gothic;—even in the Language of Greenland there is a dual number.—How so many Languages, differing so much from one another, should be all derived from one primitive Language, accounted for.—The variety made in the two Egyptian alphabets still more wonderful.—Objection answered, that it was not consistent with the wisdom and goodness of God, to confine the invention of Language to one country.—That country sufficient for the purpose.—The variety of the system of nature did not admit that many countries should be so well fitted for that purpose.—Objection, that all the people on earth have not learned the use of speech, particularly the Ourang Outangs.—But they may still learn it, as some wild people in Ethiopia have done.

Page 333

C H A P. VI.

The history of Religion fitly subjoined to the history of arts and sciences.—In what sense Religion is natural to man:—It does not belong to him in his natural state, nor even when he lives in herds,—but only in the civilised state;—not even in the first ages of civility.—This proved both by the reason of the thing, and by three examples.—The knowledge of a God arose from man's studying himself.—The progress of that study, and the reasoning, by which men were convinced of the existence of such a Being.—As men formed the first idea of a God from themselves, they naturally made him like themselves, consisting both of body and mind, but both more excellent than theirs.—Egypt the country in which Religion had its origin, as well as arts and sciences.—This proved both by the reason of the thing, and the authorities of authors.—Egypt having been governed so long by Dæmon Kings, there were two Religions there, a Philosophical Religion, and a Religion for the vulgar. Religion went from Egypt to Greece;—also to India, where several monuments of the Religion of Egypt are to be seen at this day.—The idea of a God went to other countries as well as to Greece and India, though not the worship as practised in Egypt.—A plurality of Gods according to the first Religion among men;—but one principle among them, according to the Religion both of Egypt and Greece.—As those antient Gods were supposed to have bodies, they had also senses that were to

C O N T E N T S.

be gratified;—and their minds also were to be gained, in the same way as the minds of men, by things presented to them.—The first things offered to the Gods were the fruits of the earth.—The memory of these offerings preserved both in Egypt and Greece.—When men began to eat flesh, animals were offered to the Gods.—This done so constantly when they killed animals, that to *kill* was said to *sacrifice*.—This enjoined in some nations as a duty,—particularly among the Jews.—The Gods, by those sacrifices, were supposed to have their smell gratified, and their ears pleased by the music accompanying the sacrifice.—Their eyes also pleased by magnificent Temples, Altars, and Processions.—In return for these offerings, it was expected that the Gods would give them success in war and their other occupations;—and would reveal to them future events, which they supposed was done in many different ways.—Among the Jews, Moses was obliged to establish a Religion resembling the Religion of the times:—They were incapable of receiving any other.—This the state of Religion in the first ages of the world, before arts and sciences had made any considerable progress.—But after arts and sciences were improved, Religion wore a very different face.—All Arts, Sciences, and Philosophy, came originally from Egypt.—From Egypt they went to Greece.—Of the great discoveries made by Philosophy in Theology,—Of the Platonic Doctrine of the Trinity.—The first, second, and third persons of that Trinity explained.—An error shown in our English translation, with respect to the second person of the Trinity.—Of Plato's doctrine with respect to a state of pre-existence, and a future state of rewards and punishments.—The Religion of the Philosophers of Egypt brought to Greece, and from Greece to Italy,—where it was much cultivated among the Romans.—The popular Religion of Egypt also came to Greece and Italy.—The opinions of the Philosophers must have had an influence even upon the opinions of the world.—Of the state of Religion at the time when our Saviour came to the Earth.—The understanding of men so much then improved, that they had formed the idea of Beings superior to themselves.—But their ideas of such Beings very gross.—By the advances made in Sciences and in Philosophy, men were disposed to receive a purer Religion when our Saviour came to the world.—The days of ignorance were then over, as St Paul has said in his speech to the Athenians.—An account given of that speech.—It contains the system of pure Theism, and gives a description of the true God.—Of this God, even the vulgar, among the Athenians, appear at that time to have had some idea.—St Paul says nothing of the particular doctrines of Christianity, except in one verse, where he speaks of the resurrection of Jesus Christ.—This laughed at by the Athenians,—though probably the Egyptians believed in the resurrection of the body.—St Paul would explain to his Converts the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, as 1st, The doctrine of the Trinity, of which an explanation is already given in this chapter.—2^{do}, The doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God,—of which an explanation is here given.—

C O N T E N T S.

370, The incarnation, which is likewise here explained.—Another important doctrine of Christianity is, that we must not believe that we can be happy in this life, but must look forward to the next.—This inculcated by our Saviour.—He has also provided for our happiness in this life, if we will obey the last precept he gave his Disciples, to love one another.—The Christian Religion, more a Religion of Love than any other;—yet, by the abuse of it, has produced more dissensions among men, and more crimes than any other Religion.—Of the end of this World, and the restoration of things.—This a doctrine of Antient Philosophy, with which the revelation by Jesus Christ agrees.—According to it, that new World is not at a very great distance.—This proved in the sequel of this work, by showing that not only the minds and bodies of men are degenerated, but their numbers decreased.—Thus is proved that our Saviour came to the world in the fulness of time, when it was proper he should come.—If he had come sooner, and in the days of ignorance, his doctrine could not have been received.—This proved by the example of barbarous nations, who cannot be converted to the Christian Religion;—and of the Jews themselves.—The singular circumstance of the Jews, that they are a nation without a country:—They are in all nations, and of no nation.—The worst thing in the Heathen Religion was their sacrifices.—These must have been offensive to the true God:—But that they should be practised, was necessary among people who had not an understanding so cultivated, as to make them capable of understanding true Religion.—It was indulged even to the Jews.—The reason for this indulgence.—But after the coming of our Saviour, Sacrifices, Rites, and Ceremonies, were laid aside, and a pure Religion established,—but not all Rites were laid aside, and particularly not Music.—Of the effects of Music in exciting Devotion.—It ought to be more practised by the Missionaries among the barbarous nations.—Of the present state of Religion on this earth.—Christianity the Religion of Europe,—also of Egypt, in the country about Alexandria.—There both the Jewish and Christian Sabbaths are observed.—In the Western part of Asia, Mahomedism prevails;—in the Eastern, the popular Religion of Egypt which went to India.—The Philosophical Religion also went there, as the Bramins believe in the Trinity.—Conclusion of the History of Religion, Government, Arts, and Sciences.—These three comprehend the History of Man, as from them proceed all the operations of the intellect of man.—What is commonly called History, is not what the Author calls a History of man;—nor is it a matter of science.

Page 363

Appendix.

P. 403

PREFACE.

100

P R E F A C E.

THE subject of this volume is the *History of Man*, by which I mean, not what is commonly called History, that is the History of Nations and Empires, but the History of the Species *Man*, a work of very great extent and variety; for man is not only distinguished from the other animals of this earth, by being the noblest animal; but he is also the most various, not only in his composition, being, as the antients said, a microcosme or *little world*, containing the intellectual, the animal, and vegetable, life, but also by his having passed through a greater variety of states than any other animal we know. It is, therefore, as I have said, a work of such extent and variety, that no author, ancient or modern, has so much as attempted it. Aristotle has written a most comprehensive and most various work, which he entitles *the History of Animals*: And it is a work of such extent and variety, that if he had not educated the Conqueror of the world, I am persuaded he never could have executed it; for it was, as we are told, by the information which Alexander procured him from different countries, that he was able to give an account of so very many different animals; several of which, I believe, are still unknown to us, notwithstanding the opportunity of information we have had by travellers, and by commerce. In this work Aristotle has given us what may be very properly called a History of the Animals, of which he treats: For he not only has described their bodies and their animal economy, but he has given us what he calls their *manners*,
that

that is, their affections and dispositions. But as to *Man*, though he has mentioned several particulars concerning him, in which he agrees or differs from the brutes, he has given us nothing that can be called a history of the species. Nor does he any where, in this great work, give us any particular account of the several different states through which man has passed, though, from the definition he has given of man*, it is evident he believed that he was not always the same animal that he now is. In modern times, I know only one work that can be called the history of any one species of animals, but which, the author has very modestly not entitled *the History* of that animal, but only *Memoirs that may serve for composing such a history*. The work I mean is that of a French author, Raumeur, who has given us an account of flies with four wings, under the title of *Memoires pour Servir a l'Histoire des Mouches a quatre Ailes*. But the history of such animals as flies, with *two* or *four* wings, or of even the most eminent animals of the brute kind, such as elephants, horses, lions, or tygers, is not to be compared with the *history of our own species*, being neither of such curiosity, nor of such importance for us to know.

It may be thought, that in a work of philosophy, such as this, I have bestowed too much time upon history and facts. But it is impossible that the philosophy of man can be understood without first knowing his history: Nor, without that knowledge, can any satisfactory account be given of the origin of evil; to account for which, is the chief design of this part of my work.

I will only further add, that, though I may not have had genius, learning, or leisure, sufficient to execute properly so great a work, the greatest and noblest of the historical kind, and which lays the foundation of the philosophy of man, and also is of great importance in
theology.

* See what I have said of that definition in the beginning of this volume.

theology, I hope I shall have at least the merit of exciting others of greater abilities, and more leisure, to undertake it; and if so, I shall have deserved well of the learned world, and, I think I may add, of mankind.

As to the style of this work, I have endeavoured to make it such, as I think the style of didactic writing should be, that is, a style by which the attention of the reader is not drawn from the subject neither by ornaments of words, such as metaphors and epithets, which may amuse the fancy, or tend to excite the passions of the reader, but are not conducive to the sense or argument; nor by the composition, which should not study to please the ear by the flow of periods, nor to attract the attention in a more disagreeable way, by being harsh and abrupt, like the style of Tacitus, and some of his modern imitators. What, therefore, ought to be chiefly studied in didactic writing, is plainness and perspicuity; the words being all the common words of the language, and the composition easy and natural. As to the ornaments of our prose style in English, a man who has studied the style of the best antient writers, and particularly the style of Demosthenes, as much as I have done, with the observations of the Halicarnassian upon that style, and upon style in general, must be convinced that it is impossible to ornament our English prose style, without making poetry of it, that is adorning it with Metaphors and Epithets; for the imperfection of our grammatical art is such, as does not admit of that variety of arrangement of words, which is such a beauty in the ancient composition, making not only the sound of the language more various and more pleasant to the ear, but giving a certain position to the words, such as conveys the sense more clearly and forcibly than the same words could otherwise do, as I think I have elsewhere shown* by examples

* See Dissertation 3. annexed to vol. 2. of Origin of Language, and particularly p. 569. and following.

examples from Demosthenes; whose language, for this reason, I think I understand better when I read him, or when he is well read to me, than what is written even in English. A man, however, may write very good orations; but he is no orator, unless he can pronounce them; for action, as Demosthenes said, is the first, the second, and the third quality of an orator. Now, of action, I hold pronunciation to be the chief part*; for it is by it that the words and the sense of them are conveyed to the hearers. The pronunciation of the Greek language was a thing of very great art, requiring not only a good natural voice, but also a musical voice: For, in the Greek language, there was, as the Halicarnassian informs us, both melody and rhythm†; and, among other things he praises in the stile of Demosthenes, he says, *That, when the subject requires it, his melody is magnificent and his rhythm dignified*‡. Such a pronunciation, accompanied with all the graces of action, must have made the orations of Demosthenes, the noblest production of an art, the greatest, as well as the most useful, among men; I mean the art of language, which, the Halicarnassian says, is the most *wonderful*§, though, at the same time, it be the most common of all arts; a proposition which I have endeavoured to maintain through the whole of this work, and particularly in the 1st and 14th chapters of the second book of this volume. Such speeches, therefore, as those of Demosthenes, I do not wonder that people from all parts of Greece came to Athens to hear.

Having, therefore, as I have said, formed my taste of stile upon the composition of the antients, and particularly of Demosthenes, I could

* See vol. 6. of Origin of Language, book 3. chap. 1. in the beginning.

† See what I have said at great length upon both of these, in vol. 2. of the Origin of Language, book 2. chap. 4. and 5.

‡ His words are Τα Μελα ισως μεγαλοπρεπια, και τους ρυθμους αξιομακτους. Cap. 48. *De Admiranda vi dicendi in Demosthene.*

§ Ibid. cap. 52.

P R E F A C E

v.

could not have pleased myself, nor any of my readers of good taste, if I had attempted, in a work of this kind, to make, with such materials as the English language or any other modern language affords, what is commonly called *fine language*; and had not contented myself with expressing in plain words, and with a composition, which, at the same time that it is not obscure, is not harsh or offensive to the ear, my thoughts upon subjects, which I think of great importance, and such as will certainly draw the attention of every sensible reader.

E R R A T A

Page	3.	line 26.	for ended read moved
	6.	14.	Aristotle's read in Aristotle's
	21.	11.	in Devonshire read at Hull
	36.	22.	Mechior read Melchior
	40.	24.	excretion read excretion
	46.	6.	whether read whither
	95.	23.	at once read once
	163.	11.	2000 read 1200
	315.	8.	And thus they arrived at the number ten; read Which made the number nine. And the next step was to ten;
	328.	21.	must be an read can be no
	380.	21.	things read thing

INTRODUCTION.

ALL Philosophy of every kind is the knowledge of Causes: But the First Philosophy, or Metaphysics, as it is called by Aristotle, is the knowledge of the First Causes, and the First Cause of all, or the Cause of Causes, that is, Deity. This is the highest part of Metaphysics, and which finishes the science. It is called Theology; the subject of it being God, whom to know is the summit of knowledge, and the perfection of human nature. But we must begin with the works of God, by which only he is to be known: For, as we are told in Scripture, the invisible things of God are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made *. In these works, it is the causes that we are chiefly to study; for it is through inferior causes that we are to ascend to the knowledge of the First Cause. The causes of every particular thing in this universe, or even on this earth, we cannot know or comprehend. Our knowledge, therefore,

VOL. IV.

A

must

* Paul's Epist. to the Romans Chap. I. v. 20.

must be confined to those that are most general. These are of different kinds: And therefore a general division of them was necessary; which Aristotle has given us into four kinds, the efficient, the material, the formal, and the final. And, if Aristotle had done no more in philosophy than making this distinction of causes, I should have thought he had done a great deal: For, philosophy being the knowledge of causes, he may be said, by his doctrine of causes, to have laid the very foundation of philosophy, as I have elsewhere observed*. Before Aristotle, no philosopher of Greece appears to have made this distinction accurately, but to have confounded all the four causes, and particularly the efficient and the material, which made the first philosophy in Greece, before the philosophy of Pythagoras was introduced by Plato and Aristotle, no better than downright materialism†. And some of the modern philosophers, by endeavouring to account for the motions of body from a *vis insita* in the body, or from ethers, fluids, and subtile spirits, have advanced doctrines which have a tendency to materialism: For, if bodies can in any way move themselves, there is an end of the system of theism‡.

The first of the causes I have named is the Efficient, by whose operations every thing in the material world is produced. This cause is what I call *mind*; and I divide it into four kinds; for it is either the intellectual, the animal, the vegetable mind, or that mind which I call the elemental, and which is the principle of motion in all the bodies on this earth, not only the organized, such as the animal and vegetable, but the unorganized, such as the minerals. These several minds I have been at great pains to distinguish from one another in different

* See Vol. II. of this Work, Book iv. Chap. 4. in the beginning.

† Preface to Vol. III. p. 12.

‡ Vol. II. Book iv. Chap. 3. in the beginning.

different parts of the three first volumes of this work, particularly in vol. I. p. 218; and the differences I have shortly recapitulated in the third volume, p. 20. Of the first kind of these minds is that Great Mind, from which all other minds, and all things in this universe, derive their origin; and, among other things, all other intelligences in the universe. The other three minds act by intelligence, but they have it not in themselves; therefore, though they act for a certain end or purpose, it is without knowledge of that end, without consciousness, without intelligence, deliberation, or intention, and therefore necessarily*. These three minds, thus acting without intelligence, constitute what the antient philosophers call *Nature* †: And thus the antient philosophers distinguished God from *Nature*; two words that are in every body's mouth, but no body can distinguish them accurately who has not learned the antient philosophy.

Of these three minds, the two first, viz. the animal and vegetable, our modern philosophers acknowledge, and can distinguish from one another. But the third kind of mind appears to be utterly unknown to them: Yet they observe that bodies are moved, which are neither animals nor vegetables. This has led to two great errors: The first is, that body is endued by a *vis insita*, a power essential to it; or, in other words, that body moves itself: And this is the error which Sir Isaac Newton has fallen into in his *Principia*, and which, as I have shown elsewhere ‡, has a direct tendency to materialism, or what is the same thing, atheism; though, certainly, Sir Isaac did not foresee this consequence of his doctrine, otherwise he never would have maintained it. The other error is, that God is the immediate author of all the motions of unorganized bodies, by which they are moved up or down, or in a straight line: Now, if God be the im-

A 2

mediate

* Vol. I. p. 218.

† Ibid. See also Vol. II. p. 360.

‡ Vol. I. p. 531. 546. 554.—Vol. II. p. 319. 334. 341. 372.—Vol. III. Chap. I. of Appendix.

mediate cause of the movement of body, he must be incorporated with it; for we have no conception of mind moving body otherwise *: And if, in this way, he move unorganized bodies, there is no reason why he may not, in the same way, move organized bodies; so that these philosophers may deny the existence of the animal and vegetable minds as well as of the elemental, and make God the immediate author of all the motions in the universe: And, accordingly, this is the doctrine both of Spinoza and of Dr Priestley; and they carry it so far as to maintain, that God is the immediate author of our motions too; so that we have no mind in us any more than animals, vegetables, or unorganized bodies: And I think they argue more consistently than Mr Baxter, who says that God is only the immediate author of the motions of unorganized bodies †.

It is to be observed that this mind, the principle of motion in unorganised bodies, is universal in nature, even in animals that have intellect, such as man. And therefore, as it is a principle which goes through all nature, and is essential to all natural bodies, Aristotle calls it by the name of *Nature* ‡.

And

* See Vol. III. p. 326. and Vol. H. p. 47.

† See Vol. III. p. 8. and Vol. I. p. 207.

‡ See Vol. II. p. 46. and 51.; See also Vol. I. p. 85. 205. 230. and following, in which I have given a particular account of this kind of mind. And. from the authorities there quoted, and particularly the authority of Proclus, quoted in p. 51. of Vol. II. it appears that the Platonic philosophers considered it as the *anima mundi*, which pervaded all bodies, organized and unorganized, in short the whole material world; and he further makes it the *Idea* of every thing, which gives life to the most lifeless thing, and makes things which would otherwise perish, immortal: So that it is plainly the *Idea* of Timaeus, in his treatise *De Anima Mundi*, which joined with Matter, he says constitutes Body, that is, a substance which is apprehended by our senses. And if we suppose it to proceed from a Divine Being, that being must be the

Third

And here we may observe how wonderful a composition the animal man is; for there are in him, besides body, all the several minds I have mentioned, the intellectual, the animal, the vegetable, and the elemental, that is, every thing which is to be found in the great world: And therefore he is very properly called by the antients a Microcosm, or *little world* *. And these four minds in man, I have no doubt, were the famous *τετρακτυς* of the Pythagoreans; which was thought so great a mystery of philosophy, that the Pythagoreans swore by him, who first discovered to them the *τετρακτυς*, 'Eternal source,' as they said, 'of ever-flowing nature †.' And this may suffice, by way of recapitulation of what I have said at great length in the two first volumes of this work concerning mind, the efficient cause of all things.

As to the Material cause, I have treated of it in the first chapter of the second book of the first volume, where I have shown that the antients made a distinction, unknown in modern philosophy, betwixt matter and body; for the antients abstracted from body all its qualities, even its dimensions, in the same manner as geometers abstract from figures their surfaces and their lines; and even from a line its termination, which they call a point, and say that it has no dimensions ‡. So that, however whimsical this abstraction, made by ancient metaphysicians, of matter from body, may seem to be, it is not more whimsical than the abstraction made by geometers of a point,

OR

Third Person of Plato's Trinity. And if, further, we suppose this Divine Principle to be the author, not only of the motion of all bodies, but of all the actions of intelligent beings, such as man, then it may be held to be the Third Person of the Christian Trinity.

* Vol. II. p. 136.

† Ibid. and Vol. III. p. 12.

‡ See Vol. I. p. 50. and 51.

or thing having no parts, from a line. But further, as it is admitted by all philosophers, that all the bodies on this earth, however different in appearance, are resolvable into four elemental bodies, earth, water, air, and fire, there appears to be nothing in the nature of things to hinder these four from being resolved into one matter common to them all. And if it be true, as I believe it is, that those elements change into one another, there must necessarily be in them some common matter, which, by assuming different forms, becomes fire, air, earth, or water*.

As to the Formal cause, it is explained at great length in Archytas the Pythagorean's work, *περι του παντος*, the subject of which is, *universal forms*, as I call them, (for *generals* are the subject of all sciences, but *universals* are the proper subject of metaphysics), and Aristotle's book of Categories, where we have all the different causes of that kind enumerated and reduced to the number of 10. It is perhaps the greatest work of science that ever was composed; and indeed it is the foundation of all science, since, without it, there cannot be any complete definition†. It is such a discovery as, I think, could not have been made by any single man, but only by societies of men, such as the Egyptian priests, who had been cultivating sciences for thousands of years. Though it treats only of the forms of things, yet, as these are so infinitely various, and belong to every thing in heaven or earth, making an essential part of the system of the universe, they are a very proper subject of universal philosophy or metaphysics. And accordingly, Archytas has very properly entitled his work, *Of the whole of things*. And Aristotle, though he has made his book of Categories a part of his Logic, and the first part, for which, I think, there was a very good reason, he has likewise treated of them in his Metaphysics.

The

* See Vol. I. p. 48.

† Ibid. p. 317.

The only other cause I mentioned is the Final cause, which, though it be commonly ranked by the interpreters of Aristotle as the last cause *, is in reality the first and the principal; for it is for the sake of the end that the efficient cause acts, the form is given to the thing, and matter provided to receive that form: It belongs to intelligent beings, and to them only; for it is only for an end proposed that intellect acts. It is, however, very little considered by our modern philosophers, though, I think, it ought to be the chief study of all philosophy, and especially by those who carry their speculations up to the first Cause, the Author of the universe; for we cannot sufficiently admire his wisdom and goodness, unless we know the final causes of things. I will say no more of it here, as I have treated pretty fully of it, and of causes in general, in chap. 4. of book 4. of vol. 2. of this work; also in vol. 1. book 1. chap. 4. p. 33.

In our little world, as well as in the great, there are all the four causes, as well as the four minds I have mentioned: So that in man there are not only all the active principles or minds which form the universe, but all the causes which constitute it, and make it what it is after it is formed. Of all these principles and causes, I have treated at considerable length in my first and second volumes; where, besides what I have said of mind, I have explained the nature of Motion, Energy, Action, Passion, Power, Habit, Faculty, Matter, and Form †: And, in vol. 1. book 4. I have treated of what I call the adjuncts of Nature, Time, Space, and Place.

Of the third volume, which I have prefaced with the history of antient philosophy, the subject is that most wonderful compound—*man*; of whose composition intellect is part. And, as there is no other

* See Vol. II. p. 214.

† See Vol. I. p. 46.

other intellectual being on this earth, it is only by the study of him that we can ascend to the knowledge of supreme intelligence. It is therefore, as I have said *, not to be wondered at that the seven wise men of Greece, when they joined all their wits together, could produce no greater or better fruit of their wisdom, than what they presented to their God, and inscribed on his temple at Delphi; I mean, the precept, *Know thyself* †, a precept not only of the greatest utility in the practice of life, but which leads up to the highest knowledge of which man is capable, and may be truly said to be the fountain of all knowledge, divine and human.

But though, in this third volume, I have examined the different parts of the human composition, and distinguished them, I think, accurately from one another, it is chiefly the animal part of our nature that I have considered. And I have been at pains to show how much he is changed from what he was in antient times, in health, strength, and size of body, and as the mind is so intimately connected with the body, that the mind also is degenerated in these later times. I have also spoken, in the third volume, of the natural state of *man*; and I will venture to say, that there are collected in that volume more facts concerning man in that state, or near to that state, than are to be found in any one book; and as what is called philosophy in this age, is chiefly conversant about facts of natural history, one should think that we should at least be as curious about the natural history of our own species as about the natural history of other animals, even some of the lowest rank, such as worms and flies, upon which volumes have been written. In this fourth volume I propose to say a great deal more upon the natural history of man, and to trace his progress from the natural state

10

* See Vol. II. p. 90.

† *γνῶθι σεαυτόν*. Plato's Protagoras, p. 243. edit. Serrani.

INTRODUCTION.

9

to the state of the highest civilization. And this will be the subject of the first book of this volume, which may be called the *History of Man*. The subject of the second book will be the *Philosophy of Man*: And the third book will conclude the Science of Metaphysics with *Theology*.

VOL. IV.

3

ANTIENT

A N T I E N T M E T A P H Y S I C S.

B O O K I.

T H E H I S T O R Y O F M A N.

C H A P. I.

Of the difficulty of defining Man.—This difficulty arises from its being necessary to define what he is by Nature.—Aristotle the only author who has defined Man.—His definition explained, and the full definition given translated into English.—All the operations of the Human Mind, the animal as well as the intellectual, proceed from Comparison.—The wonderful chain of things in Nature, to be seen in the progress of the Human Mind.—This definition of Man not intelligible to those who have studied only the Philosophy of Mr Locke.—The author's apology for pretending to teach a better philosophy than any that has been invented in modern times.—The propriety of defining Man by his comparative faculty and the capacity of intellect and science.—Nothing said of the Body of Man in the definition;—nor has Aristotle any where else said that he is

by nature erect.—The contrary is now found to be the case.—The facts by which this is proved.—The wonderful progress of Man, from a quadruped to such an animal as he now is.—Of the world of art which he has created,—and made all the Powers of Nature subservient to him.

WHAT is *Man*, is a question which I believe no person can answer who has not studied the antient Philosophy. What makes the difficulty of answering it, is, that the definition of every animal must inform us what the animal is by Nature, independent of Art, that is, of any quality he may have acquired by teaching, or by observation and experience: For if, by natural instinct, he practises any thing which has the appearance of art, being done by rule and measure, it may very properly be made part of the definition of such an animal. For example, the bee may very properly be defined an animal that makes honey, and lays it up in hexagon cells; but as to man, I believe there is no body who supposes that he practises all those wonderful arts, which we see him practise, by mere natural instinct, without teaching, observation, or experience, unless he believe, as some men do, that man speaks by nature: For if, in that way, he can practise the art of more difficult invention than any other, and of practice too so difficult, that if we were not in the constant use of it from our early infancy, we could have no use of it at all, he may practise every other art by nature. The question then is, What is Man by nature, without any of the arts or sciences which he has invented? Now this question Aristotle, and Aristotle only, has answered; for he has defined man to be ζῷον λογικόν, θνητόν, νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν. What is meant by ζῷον, or *animal*, which Aristotle makes the genus of this definition, is well known to be a being which perceives by senses; but there is more difficulty to know what he means by the specific difference

difference of λογικον, by which a man not learned in the antient Philosophy, and not able to make the distinction between λογος and νοϋς, will suppose that he meant what we call *rational*. But it is evident, from what follows, that Aristotle did not understand that Man was by nature a *rational* animal, as we understand the word. To know what λογικον means, we must know what is meant by λογος. Now λογος, in its proper signification, and as it is used by Euclid, who uses no word in a metaphorical sense, denotes a certain relation betwixt things, such as numbers and figures*, and which we express in English by the word *ratio*. Now, it is by comparison that we discover the relation of things to one another, and therefore λογικος denotes what has the faculty of making this comparison, according to the ordinary derivation of Greek words.

Man, therefore, according to Aristotle, is not only sensitive, as all animals are, but he has the faculty of comparing his sensations: And in this way he is distinguished from the lowest class of animals, such as moths, and worms and other reptiles, and those imperfect animals called Zoophytes, some of which, like vegetables, do not move from one place to another†. These do not appear to have that comparative faculty; but man is ranked, by Aristotle, with the higher specieses of brutes, such as horses and dogs, who certainly have that comparative faculty; for they distinguish one kind of food from another, and of the different objects, which they perceive by their senses, they choose what suits them best. Any man, accustomed to ride, will observe, that his horse, when left to himself, chooses that part of the road which is smooth and not deep, in preference to that which is stony or deep. Now, he could not give that preference without comparing the two. And the brutes form what we may call

a

* See Vol. I. of Origin of Lang. p. 81. and p. 338.

† Aristoteles de Historia Animalium, lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 193. edit. Du Valli.

a resolution, by which their natural instinct directs them to do one thing rather than another; and we see them very often deliberating, when their natural appetites draw them different ways. Thus I have seen a dog deliberate most anxiously, and debate with himself, when his love for his master prompted him to follow him through a rapid river, while the fear of the water restrained him. Aristotle adds next in the definition, what needs no explanation, that he is *mortal*.

Thus far Aristotle has exalted our nature, so as to be ranked with the better kinds of brutes; but he has not yet told us what distinguishes man from them even in his natural state. But now he gives us that distinction, and very properly concludes his definition with it: For he says "That man is an animal, capable of intellect, (or to translate the Greek word literally), that may receive intellect, and also of science." And here the reader will observe, that I translate the Greek word *nous*, not by the English word *reason*, as is commonly done, but by the word *intellect*, by which I mean to denote that faculty of the mind which forms ideas, and sees the *one* in the *many*; whereas Reason, according to the English sense of the word, denotes that faculty by which we compare our ideas, and form the last thing mentioned by Aristotle in this definition, viz. Science, which is formed by the discursive faculty of the human mind, in Greek *diavonai*.

The full definition, therefore, of Man, according to Aristotle, is, "That he is a Comparative Animal, (that is, an animal, who has the faculty of Comparing), who has also the capacity of acquiring Intellect and Science, and who is Mortal."

And here we may observe how properly Aristotle has set at the head of his definition of Man this Comparative faculty, as from it every

every operation of the human mind, animal as well as intellectual, is to be derived. And first, he compares corporeal objects, or the objects of sense, with which all our knowledge in this life must begin; and by that comparison he discovers that some of them are more fit for the purposes of animal life than others, and to these gives the preference, being directed either by his senses, to which some of them are more agreeable than others, or by instinct, which prompts him as well as other animals to choose what is fittest for the preservation of the individual, and the continuation of the kind.

The next act I shall mention of this comparative faculty, and which is also common to him with the Brute, is that by which he discovers that the several qualities, he perceives by his senses in any particular object, are joined together in one object. This is an union which, as Proclus, *ad Timæum*, p. 76. has very well observed, is not discovered by the senses, which only report each its own perception. It is therefore discovered by the λογος, or comparative faculty, which is common to us with the brute. Another exercise of that faculty is that, by which he discovers an object to be the same with that which he had seen before. This he does, by comparing the object, when he sees it a second time, with the picture of it which he had retained in his Phantasia after seeing it the first time. And farther, when he sees an object of the same kind, having all or most of those marks which his senses had perceived in the first object, he knows it to be of the same kind. And this faculty of comparison the brute likewise has; for it is by it that he distinguishes animals of his own species from those of another, or animals of different specieses from one another, as a man from a horse, or a horse from an ox.

From

From this comparison naturally arises another comparison, but which it does not appear that the brute makes, so that here the road parts betwixt man and brute. By this comparison, which is of the thing with itself, man, when he begins to have the use of intellect, and to form ideas, discovers that there are certain qualities in the thing, which are principal, and distinguish it more from other things than its other qualities. For example, he discovers in a horse that he has a long body, long legs, an elevated neck, a head and tail of a particular form; and that he is swifter of foot, and, when he lays himself out, covers more ground, than other animals. From these principal qualities he separates other qualities, which are common to him with other animals, such as that of colour, or having four feet; and thus he forms the particular idea of a horse: And the forming in this way the ideas of particular things, is the first operation of the human intellect, without which we could have no general ideas, as a general idea is nothing else but the particular idea generalized*. When we are further advanced in arts, sciences, and philosophy, we discover what is unknown to our modern philosophers, that the particular idea of any thing is a mind or immaterial substance, which animates the thing, gives it motion and all its qualities, and makes it what it is, distinct from every thing else†. And here we may observe, that this comparison of the object with itself is nothing more than making more accurate and more particular that comparison, by which the brutes as well as we discover that other animals are of the same species with themselves, and by which they also distinguish different specieses. The reader will also observe, that here we

* See what I have said upon this subject in Vol. II. of this Work, Book II. Chap. II. p. 76. and 85. The whole chapter is worth reading by those who desire to know accurately the difference betwixt sensations and ideas.

† Ibid. p. 73, 74, and 75.

use the faculty of abstraction and separation, which is peculiar to the intellectual nature, and without which we never could have formed ideas of any kind. For in this material world, as some of the antient philosophers have observed, particularly Anaxagoras, as I remember, all things are so mixt with all things, that unless we can make that separation and discrimination, which is made by abstraction, we cannot have any distinct notion of any thing, but must perceive all things, together with all their qualities, as the brutes perceive them. Now even abstraction cannot be without comparison; for we must compare the thing we abstract with that from which we abstract it. Another thing to be observed is, that in forming the particular idea, as well as the general, we discover the *one* in the *many*; for we discover that there is one thing, or a certain determinate number of things, which make the objects, that we perceive by our senses, what they are and nothing else. Here, too, there is comparison; for we must compare the *one* with the *many*, by which comparison we discover that the *one* contains the *many*.

The next step in this progression, and by which we are still more distinguished from the brute than by the former, is that by which we discover that the *one*, which we have found in one individual, is to be found in *many*. And thus we form the idea of a species, then of a genus, and so on till we ascend to the highest genuses, explained by Aristotle in his Categories. And in this progression we may observe, that we still use those two great instruments of human knowledge, Generalization and Abstraction; for we must both generalize the species, and abstract from it the specific differences, in order to form the idea of the genus; and both these operations, as I have said, cannot be without comparison. In this manner we form ideas superior and subordinate.

The next step in the human progression is *Propositions*, informing which we must necessarily compare the two ideas that we join together in the proposition: And by that comparison we discover that the one is either a part of the other, or not a part but excluded from it; for the truth of all propositions, positive or negative, is the result of that comparison. Some of these relations of ideas we discover intuitively, and such propositions we call Axioms. But of other ideas we discover the relation by a process we call Reasoning or Syllogism; but which still goes on by comparing the ideas with one another. Thus I think I have shewn, that both intellect and science are derived from that faculty of Comparison, which Aristotle has made the first thing in the Definition of Man; and which, by our having the capacity to carry it further than the brute, makes us Intelligent and Scientific Creatures. *2dly*, It appears that the definition, which Plato has given us of the operation of the mind when it forms ideas that is, making *one* of the *many*, is perfectly just, and applies not only to ideas, but to all the operations of the intellect in forming arts and sciences. And, *lastly*, from the account I have given of the progress of the human mind, what I have elsewhere said * is evident, that in this state of our existence we know not the essence of any thing. What we know is only the relations of things to one another: For example, that one thing is the genus or species of another; that there are certain differences which distinguish the species from the genus; that there are properties of things which are peculiar to them, and others that are accidental. What we know, therefore, is all in system, which is constituted by the relations and connections of things to one another. And thus, by ascending from lesser to greater systems, we may come at length to the contemplation of the system of the universe and its great Author, which, to the intellectual mind, is the beatific vision. And here we may observe the order and regularity

* Vol. I. of this work, p. 56.

regularity of that system, by which man is connected with the brute, and how he begins where the brute ends, that is, with comparing an object of sense with itself, so as to discover what is principal and predominant in it: So that there is here, as well as in other parts of nature, a chain where no link is wanting, and where every thing is connected with every thing.

What I have here said, I know, will not be intelligible to those who have studied only Mr Locke's Philosophy, and consequently have not learned to distinguish betwixt Ideas and Sensations, and know nothing of the *one* in the *many*, which, according to Antient Philosophy, is the foundation of all the operations of the human intellect; and I can tell those gentlemen farther, that they never will understand this, nor any other part of Antient Philosophy, till they give up all they have learned in modern books of philosophy, and have come to know that they know nothing of philosophy: For, as I have observed elsewhere*, *to know that we do not know*, is the foundation of all human knowledge. Now this is such a sacrifice of a man's vanity, as we are to expect very few will make; and indeed to do so requires a candour and a love of truth and knowledge very rarely to be met with in this age: But even men of the greatest candour and modesty might be offended, if I pretended to have invented a philosophy so much better than what this age or modern times have produced.—But that is not the case: I pretend to have invented no philosophy, I only mean to restore the philosophy of men much superior to us, I mean the antient Egyptians and Greeks, who, if they had been inferior to us in genius and natural parts, cultivated philosophy so much more than ever it was cultivated any where else, that they must have excelled us in it,

C 2

and

* Origin and Progress of Language, Vol. V. p. 296.

and which philosophy was, for two centuries after the restoration of letters, the only philosophy of Europe.—But to return to the *Man* of Aristotle.

He has defined him to be “A creature of Intellect and Science *only in capacity*,” marking in this way the progress of man, as well as of every thing else on this earth, from capacity to actuality; for every thing here has first the capacity of becoming something, before it is actually that thing: And it is from this grand and comprehensive view of nature that Aristotle has given us that fine definition of motion, the great agent in all natural operations, which I have elsewhere explained *. How much longer the progress in man is, from mere capacity to the completion of his nature, than of any other animal, I shall presently observe.

As Aristotle thinks the mind is principal in all animals, he has defined man by his mind only, and said nothing of his body in the definition, nor any where else, as far as I can recollect, except in his *History of Animals*, where he has told us, that man is more fitted by nature to be a biped than any other animal. But from thence I infer, that he did not think that he was by nature a biped †: For if he had thought so, he would not have said that man was fitted by nature to be a biped more than any other animal; that is, as I understand the words, he could become a biped more easily than any other animal; but he would have said plainly and shortly, that he was by nature a biped. But if he had said so, he would have been mistaken; for it now appears to be certain, that man is by nature a quadruped. This I have proved ‡, by sundry instances of savages that have been caught.

* Vol. I. of this work, Book I. Chap. III. p. 196.

† Vol. I. of *Origin and Progress of Language*, p. 186. of second edition.

‡ *Ibidem*.

caught in different parts of Europe, going upon all four. One of them was well known in England, under the name of Peter the Wild Boy; for he was caught in the woods of Hanover not many years ago, and brought to England, where I saw him *. And there is another very remarkable instance, which I have mentioned in the third volume of this work †, of a quadruped of the human species that was found in the woods of Saxony. And I have lately discovered that there were found in Devonshire two children, a boy that appeared to be about ten years of age, and a girl of twelve, going upon all four with surprising celerity. This I learnt from a newspaper that was published in Devonshire, of which I have given the words in the note below ‡. But besides these instances of single savages walking that way, I have mentioned, in the passage from the Origin and Progress of Language, above quoted, two nations, namely the Hottentots and Caribbees, where the children walk so long upon all four, that they are taught with much difficulty to walk upright.

These examples prove, I think, beyond doubt, that the natural motion of man is upon *all four*. They are not very many in number;.

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 57. and also p. 368.

† Ibid. p. 74.

‡ *A. Esq.*—There are at present two children at Crowys in Devonshire, who have been suffered, by their mother, to run wild from their infancy rather than accept of the parish assistance. The one is a boy of ten, the other a girl of twelve years of age. They are both in a state of nature, feeding only on wild berries, and running on *all fours* with amazing celerity. If pursued, they utter a terrific scream, and hide themselves on the top of a hill, or in the recesses of a thicket. They are never seen in a standing posture; nor can they be prevailed on to approach any person but their mother, with whom, though they cannot speak, they have always kept up a distant and fearful communication." What is become of these children, or whether they be yet existing, I cannot tell, though I have ordered an inquiry to be made.

ber; nor is it possible that such a fact in natural history should be proved by induction of many examples. And indeed I think it is surprising that so many should have been found in a civilized country, such as Europe, where it is impossible that any individuals should have been found in this state, except such as, by some accident, were exposed when they were infants. But if there were any doubt in the matter, the way of walking of our own infants, upon all four, should convince us that it is the natural motion of man. And I am persuaded, that if we were not at pains to give them the erect posture very early, they would continue to walk upon all four as long as the children of the Hottentots and Carribbees do; and if they were allowed to run wild as long as the Saxon savage did, they would be erected with as much difficulty as he was, to whose shoulders they were obliged to hang weights, to counteract that natural propensity he had to fall prone; and which would be as strong in our children, if by custom, from their earliest infancy, it were not counteracted.

Now, from a quadruped, and a creature only capable of intellect and science, what a wonderful progress to man in his present state. And first, as to body, what a difference betwixt such an animal, and the noble, erect, stately figures of the heroic age, or even of such men as we are: And as to the mind, what comparison can there be betwixt a mind void of all ideas, and the minds of the Egyptian priests, or the sages of Greece, replete with science and philosophy. Then what a number of arts of necessity, ease, pleasure, and elegance have been invented by this quadruped, more than I believe have yet been numbered. In short he has made a world of art, to which nothing we know can be compared, except the great world of nature, the work of Infinite Wisdom and Power. In forming this world of art, he has used all the materials which the natural world afforded him, and has ransacked the animal, vegetable, and mineral

mineral kingdoms; and, not content with what he found above ground, he has dug into the bowels of the earth, and from thence produced metals. But these could have been of little use to him, if he had not brought down from heaven fire, as it is said, but which he now strikes out of flints, a discovery that the Chinese have not yet made. Of the vegetable he makes food, and fuel for fire, and many other uses; and as to animals, it is surprising what a dominion he has obtained over them. The fiercest and strongest of them he has been able to resist and conquer; others he has tamed and subdued, and made useful to him, even some of them of the largest size, such as the elephant; others of them he has domesticated, and made companions of them, and guardians of his house, and others of them he uses for food. Nor is his dominion confined to the land; he reigns over the sea, and makes it subservient to him, not only in furnishing most delicate food, but in wafting him to the most distant countries, and bringing from thence all the good things of those countries which he by that means enjoys. The Leviathan,

—whom God—

Created hugest that swim the Ocean stream *

he has been able to conquer and kill, in his own element, and make useful for the purposes of life; and modern art has shewn upon the sea a machine of enormous size, vomiting fire and smoke with the noise of thunder, and sending death and destruction to an amazing distance: And this so prodigious machine is governed by little men such as we, and made to ride triumphant over the waves. In short, such is this wonderful world of art, that not only those stupendous productions of it I have mentioned, but even the meanest domestic utensil, astonishes the philosopher who knows from what source it comes.

Now,

* Milton.

Now this wonderful progress of man, so much more wonderful than that of any other animal, Aristotle knew: For he has told us, that in his natural state he has not the use of intellect, but only the capacity of acquiring it. Now it is by intellect that all the world of art has been produced, and man made such as we see him. And indeed if we could suppose, as many do, that such a natural state of man, as I have described, never existed, then Aristotle would have defined a mere nonentity, a creature that neither is, nor ever was. But that is not the case; and he has not only properly defined man, but in his definition given a kind of history of the species, carrying it on from the first beginning of it, to its completion and perfection in intellect and science: And, in my opinion, there never was a better definition given of any thing.

CHAP.

C H A P. II.

Of the several steps of the human progression from the Brute to the Man.—The Author has seen three stages of that progression;—first, Peter the Wild Boy;—secondly, The Ourang Outang, of whom the Author has discovered some facts, since he published upon the subject;—thirdly, The Wild Girl in France.—She was an amphibious animal.—Several particulars concerning her mentioned.

THE subject of this chapter will be to mark some of the first steps of this wonderful progression of man. Of these I have seen with mine own eyes three, which I believe is what very few now living can say. The first I saw, was in the pure natural state when he was caught in the woods of Hanover, walking on all four. It was Peter the Wild Boy, as he was called, whom I have mentioned above*. I saw him twice, and I had a very particular account of him from an Oxford gentleman, who, at my desire, went to see him; which account I have published†. He had learned to articulate but few words, though he was put to school, and no doubt a great deal of pains bestowed to teach him to speak. But this we should not wonder at, when we consider what trouble it requires to teach deaf men to speak, though born and brought up among us. Of his being a man, there never was the least doubt entertained; and that he was not an idiot, or defective in natural capacity,

VOL. IV.

D

capacity,

* Page 21.

† Vol. III. p. 368. See also p. 58. of the same volume, where I have given the accounts of him that were published in the newspapers, immediately after he was brought to England.

capacity, I think is evident from the several accounts of him which I have published in the passages above quoted. And indeed, from what I saw of him myself, I think I can attest, that he had as much understanding as could be expected in a man who had learned none of our arts, not even the use of his own body so as to walk erect, till he was 15 years of age ; for till then he was a quadruped.

The next step of this progression is the Ourang Outang, or *Man of the Woods*, as the name imports, by which he is called by the people of Africa, where he is to be seen, and who do not appear to have the least doubt that he is a man ; which, as they live in the country with him, they should know better than we can do. Two of them I saw in London some years ago, and one of them I could have purchased for L. 50 ; which money, poor as I am, I would have given for him, and been at the expence of his education, if I had not been convinced, not only that *he* was a man, but that it was of absolute necessity that, in the progress of the human species, man should at some time or another be such an animal : For, if he was originally a quadruped, as I think I have proved by facts incontestible, with only a natural aptitude, more than any other animal, to walk on two, as Aristotle has said, the first step in his progression was to become a biped, to which, by nature, he was so much adapted. I will not here repeat what I have elsewhere said at so great length, in proof of the humanity of the Ourang Outang *, where I think I have demonstrated that he is a man, both in

* See chap. 4th of book 2d of vol. I. of the *Origin of Language*, 2d edition, and particularly p. 289. of that chapter, where I have summed up the evidence of his being a man : In which there is one circumstance deserving particular notice, that he carries off negro boys and girls to make servants of them, and keeps them for years, using them with great gentleness and humanity ; a thing of which we cannot conceive any brute animal capable. See also what I have said in the Appendix to vol.

in mind and body, and particularly as to his mind, by which, as I have observed, Aristotle has chiefly distinguished animals: For I have shewn that he has the sense of what is decent and becoming *, which is peculiar to man, and distinguishes him from the brute as much as any thing else. And he has a sense of honour, which is really surprising, and such as is not to be found in many men among us; for he cannot bear to be exposed as a show, nor to be laughed at; and travellers mention examples of some of them having died of vexation, for being so treated †. He has also the feeling of humanity in a strong degree; and a sense of justice, as is evident, from a remarkable example given ‡. Further, he has made some progress in the arts of life; for he builds huts §, and he has got the use of a stick for attacking or defending, which, as Horace observes ||, was the first artificial weapon man used, after he had ceased to use his native weapons, his nails and fists. He has learned also the use of fire ¶, which is more than the inhabitants of the Ladrone Islands had learned, when they were discovered by the Portuguese; and lastly, he buries his dead **.

D 2

Thus

vol. III of this work, and particularly what I have there stated from a French Book of Travels, lately published, where there is a fact related, p. 360. which, if true, puts an end to the question, viz. that the Ourang Outang not only copulates with females of our species, and produces children, but that the offspring of that copulation does likewise produce.

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, 2d edit. p. 273. 279. and 291. From which passages, it appears, that both the males and females there mentioned had a sense of modesty, which made them conceal their nudities.

† Ibid. p. 282.—284.

‡ Ibid. p. 204.—288.

§ Ibid. p. 274.—277.—283.

|| *Sermonum*, lib. i. Sat. 3.

¶ Origin of Language, p. 285.

** Ibid. p. 274.

Thus I have proved, that the Ourang Outang is not only a man, with respect to his body, but also in mind, the principal part of man and of all other animals. As the reader, however, may be desirous to know still more of this wonderful phenomenon of human nature I will add here some information concerning him, which I have lately received from a gentleman of the name of Begg, who was captain of a Liverpool ship, employed in the slave trade on the coast of Africa. He was promised, he told me, a handsome reward, if he could bring home an Ourang Outang from Angola, where he saw herds of them, and was at great pains, with the assistance of his crew, to get hold of one of them; but to no purpose. He therefore resolved, that as he could get none of them alive, he would try to get one or more of them dead: And accordingly he fired upon them, and killed some of them, which I am persuaded he would not have done, if he had been as fully convinced, as I am, that they were of the human species. But in this, too, he was likewise disappointed; for, before he and his crew could get to the place where they fell, they were carried off by their companions, for the purpose, as he supposes, of burying them, which, we are informed by others, they practice*.

I have corresponded with this gentleman likewise by letters, in one of which he says, that "In a voyage to Old Callabar in Africa, "I purchased a female Ourang Outang from one of the natives. She "was, as I was informed, about eight months old, four foot six "inches high, of a dark brown colour, but white about the breasts; "of a gentle disposition, walked generally upright on her hind feet, "sometimes on all four; but the latter seemed to me not to be her "natural motion. Palm nuts, roots, and subacid fruits were her "favourite food. She would not eat beef or any animal substance. "Water, and wine drawn from the palm tree (very much esteemed "by

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 274.

“ by the natives), were her constant drink. She would often drink
“ a tumbler glass of wine and water, and always put the glass soft-
“ ly down on its bottom, and never broke one. She was very fond
“ of the girls and boys, but more particularly of the latter, and
“ would weep and cry like a child when she was vexed ; but never
“ shewed any signs of great ferocity, and was easily appeased. I
“ gave her a blanket for a bed, which she would take great pains
“ to spread in such a manner as to make it smooth and easy, and
“ then would lie down. She always slept with her hands (if I may
“ use the expression) under her head, and would snore when asleep,
“ resembling the human species. She lived three months, and died
“ of the dysentery.

“ The following is the information I have been able to collect
“ from the inhabitants of Africa, where I have been, on whose ve-
“ racity we cannot altogether depend ; but having compared differ-
“ ent accounts, I always found them in a great measure to corre-
“ spond.

“ That they have been seen in separate great bodies, attacking each
“ other with sticks with great animosity. That they generally build
“ their nests or houses together in great numbers, a single Ourang
“ Outang being but seldom or never seen separately. That they
“ often have been known to beat and bruise the negroes, and even
“ to kill them, when fired at by them. That the common size of
“ an Ourang Outang is from five and half to six feet. That they
“ have great strength in their arms, and run with great agility.
“ That they have a kind of chattering guttural noise they make,
“ but whether they can communicate their ideas or not to each o-
“ ther, I cannot say ; but it is the received opinion among the na-
“ tives that they can. That dead Ourang Outangs have been found
“ covered with leaves of trees, but whether from accident or design
“ could not be ascertained.—This is what Information I could ac-
“ quire

"quire from the negroes; but I can by no means vouch for the truth of any part of it. What I say from my own observation you may depend on for fact."

From this account of Mr Begg, it is evident that they are so far advanced towards the political life, as to herd together, and to communicate together, by a chattering guttural noise, which, I am persuaded, led the way among all people to articulation and the use of speech. And the Bristol merchant, with whom I have corresponded, and whose communications I have mentioned in the 1st volume of the *Origin and Progress of Language* *, says, that he heard that they were so far advanced in the political life, as to have a king or governor †. It appears also, from Mr Begg's account, that they have so much of the social spirit in them, and are so much attached to their herd, as not to neglect them even when they are dead, but to carry off their bodies for burial.

This animal, it is to be observed, lives entirely upon the fruits of the earth; for the carnivorous diet I hold to be unnatural to man, and that he was first driven to it by necessity, which could not be the case of the Ourang Outang, who lives in a fruitful country, very thinly peopled. Further, he has not the use of water, except to drink it; for swimming or sailing, I hold to be likewise unnatural to man, and that it was also necessity that first drove him to it.

There is another observation I have to make, which is, that the Ourang Outang sometimes walks upon all four. And the Bristol merchant, above mentioned, says, that the smallest class of this species, called *Chimpenza* by the natives, walks oftener on all four, than upright ‡. And there is a French writer, La Brosse, who

* Page 281.

† Ibid. p. 282.

‡ Ibid. p. 282.

who has made a collection of voyages in the South Seas, one of which gives an account of an island, where the people, though they be so far advanced in the arts of life, as to have the use of speech, yet walk sometimes upon *all four*. This, I think, shews very clearly, that originally they walked upon all four, as well as the Ourang Outang; and that they have not been very long from that primæval state, any more than the Ourang Outang. These examples, I think, prove very clearly what I have laid down in the preceding chapter, that man, in the first stage of his natural life, was a quadruped; so that it was very natural he should retain that way of walking, in the first stages of his civilized life.

This account I have given of the Ourang Outang, agrees perfectly with the description which Horace gives us of man, in the first stage of his existence on this earth. I quoted it above, p. 27.; but I will give it here entire.

Cum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
Mutum ac turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter,
Unguibus et pugnīs, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant armis, quæ post fabricaverat usus:
Donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,
Nominaque invenere: Dehinc abstinere bello,
&c.

This account of man, in his first state, applies so exactly to the Ourang Outang, that it may be said to be a description of him; for man is said first to creep, that is, to go upon all four, and then he is very properly denominated *mutum ac turpe pecus*. After that, he is erected, and gets the use of an artificial weapon, such as the Ourang Outang uses. Next, he invents rude and barbarous cries, which Mr Begg calls chattering guttural sounds, *quibus voces sensusque notarent*, that is, by which men communicated their sensations, appetites, and desires to one another. And, last of all, they formed ideas,

and

and invented words to express them, which Horace calls *nomina*. But this is a step in the progress towards the civilized life, which the Ourang Outang has not yet made. This history of man, I am persuaded, Horace learned from the philosophers with whom he conversed in Athens; and I hold it to have been the general opinion of the Greek philosophers at that time, and particularly of the Epicureans, who studied facts of natural history very much *. Of this sect Horace was, though not wholly addicted to it;

(Nullius addictus (as he says) jurare in verba magistri.)

but getting all the information he could from the other sects of philosophy.

There are, I know, many, who will think this progress of man, from a quadruped and an Ourang Outang to men such as we see them now a days, very disgraceful to the species. But they should consider their own progress as an individual. In the womb, man is no better than a vegetable; and, when born, he is at first more imperfect, I believe, than any other animal in the same state, wanting almost altogether that comparative faculty, which the brutes, young and old, possess †. If, therefore, there be such a progress in the individual, it is not to be wondered that there should be a progress also in the species, from the mere animal up to the intellectual creature: But, on the contrary, I should think it not agreeable to that wonderful order and progression of things that we observe in nature, if it were otherwise; for the species, with respect to the genus,

* Epicurus was a diligent inquirer into facts of natural history, particularly concerning the progress of men in the invention of arts. And accordingly Lucretius tells us, that he discovered that men learned music from the singing of birds, which, as I shall presently shew, is confirmed by what I learned from the savage girl I saw in France.

† See what I have said of this comparative faculty, p. 13. of this volume.

nus, is to be considered as an individual, and accordingly it is called, by Aristotle, το ἄτομον τῆ ἰδιῆς.

The last step of this progression I likewise saw, and it was a great one. It was the wild girl, or *fille sauvage*, as the French called her, who came from a country where the people had learned to articulate very imperfectly indeed, but sufficiently to communicate their wants and desires. I saw her in Paris about 26 years ago, and conversed with her much, as she had been then in Paris for several years, and spoke French well enough. She was taken up by a French ship somewhere upon the coast of Labradore, and was carried to one of the West India islands, from whence she sailed in a ship, which was wrecked upon the coast of Flanders, and only she and a negro girl were saved. Her first appearance in France was at a village called Songè, near to Chalon in Champagne, whither I went to inquire about her. She was first seen there swimming a river, and coming out of it with a fish in her hand, which she had caught: For she told me, that in her country they lived like beavers, always near water, and caught the fish with their hands, by diving, as the people of the Ladrone Islands do. They were hunters, too; and she and the negro girl, in their journey from Flanders, subsisted on game, which they caught by speed of foot. She said, that in her country, besides language, they had a certain music, which they had formed in imitation of birds. But they had no use of fire, and in that, too, they resembled the people of the Ladrone Islands; and she told me, that, when she first came to France, a fire in a room was her terror and abhorrence; and the eating of flesh, dressed by fire, threw her into a very bad disease, of which she recovered with much difficulty. She was wonderfully swift of foot, and could overtake, in that way, almost any animal, and then knock it on the head with a bludgeon she wore, which she called a *bouton*, a name given, by the inhabitants of the Carrib-

bee Islands, to a bludgeon; from which it appears she had been in one of those islands, in her way from America to France. She could climb a tree, too, like a squirrel, and leap from one tree to another; but all these bodily faculties, she told me, with much regret, she had lost at the time I saw her. Who would desire to know more of her, may read her life, published at Edinburgh in the year 1768, translated from the French by a clerk of mine, who was with me in France. The facts contained in the French work, I was assured, might be depended on, by M. la Condamine, who knew the lady that wrote it. In the preface prefixed to the translation, I have related several facts concerning her, which I learned from the girl herself: And if the reader be desirous to know still more concerning her, he may read a conversation that I had with her, which I have printed from a pocket book that I then kept in Paris, and have published in the appendix to this volume.

CHAP.

C H A P. III.

The first step that men made, in their progress to civilization, was to learn the use of their own body—first, By erecting themselves; then by learning the use of their hands; and lastly to swim.—Swimming not natural to man; but his acquisitions in that way wonderful.—Till man learned the use of his own body, he could not provide sufficiently for his subsistence.—At first he lived upon the natural fruits of the earth.—These failing, he took to hunting and fishing, being able to live upon any kind of food.—But only agriculture could furnish subsistence for numbers of men, living together in close communication.—Before such an art could be invented and practised, language was necessary.

FROM those examples of wild men I have mentioned, it is, I think evident, that the first art man must have learned, was the use of his own body: And he must have begun by erecting himself, without which he could not have had the advantage of the length of his body, for attack or defence, or for the practice of the several arts of life. Besides, it gave him the *os sublime*—enabled him to look at his native seat, the Heavens—and gave that dignity to his appearance, which was suitable for an animal that was destined to govern on this earth.

The necessary consequence, too, of the erect posture, was the use of the hands, a most useful organ, without which, as Xenophon has

well observed, our reason would have availed us little in the invention and practice of arts.

Thus far, therefore, the Ourang Outang is advanced in the arts of life; but he still retains so much of his primitive natural state, that he sometimes goes on all four, as Mr Begg, in his letter, has said, and also the French gentleman, above quoted*.

There is another use of the body, which man has not from nature, as many other animals have, but has learned by practice or teaching, I mean swimming: For of the Indians of North America, who excel us so much in bodily feats, none can swim, except those who live near the sea, or a great river, and have practised it, as Adair and others, who have published accounts of North America, tell us; and the wild girl, above mentioned, described to me very particularly, the pains her mother took to teach her to swim; but with that teaching and practice, she became quite amphibious; such as the inhabitants of the Ladrone Islands are, who subsist, in a great measure, by the fish which they catch with their hands in the sea; though I am persuaded, it was necessity which first drove man to seek for food in an element not natural to him.

There is a weekly publication in Spain, called *Semanario Erudito*, containing many curious facts. In a volume of it published in 1788, there is a piece written by Don Mechior de Macanaz, a gentleman of great learning, who was employed in many negotiations, in the reign of Philip V. The translation of it, for which I am obliged to a very learned and worthy gentleman of my acquaintance, Dr Geddes, who resided for ten years in Spain, I have given in

* P. 27. of this volume. See also vol. III. of this work, p. 349. and 361.

in the note below, as it contains several other curious facts concerning wild men*.

From

* " Francis de la Vega, and Mary del Casar, his wife, inhabitants of the village of Liexganes, in the territory of Cudeyo, of the archbishopric of Burgos, two leagues from Santander, had, besides other children, a son called Francis, who, at the age of fifteen years, having been apprentice to a joiner for two years at Bilboa, went to swim with other boys, on the 23d of June in the year 1674, and disappeared; nor was he again heard of, until he was caught like a fish in the sea near Cadiz, in the year 1679. He did not now speak any language; but having been brought to a convent of Franciscans, he pronounced the word *Liexganes*, the name of the village where he had been born. From this it was conjectured, that he must have been of that place, and thither he was conducted, and his mother immediately knew him. He remained there nine years: He ate what they gave him; he put on his clothes and his stockings and shoes, if he was desired to do so: He carried a letter punctually enough to the place he was ordered; and, having been sent with one to Santander, he swam over the bay, which is more than a league broad; and when he had got the answer, he returned by the same way. He was six feet high; his hair was red and short, like to a new born child's; his complexion was fair. He seemed to be incapable of reasoning by himself; but capable of understanding what he was commanded to do. He had lost the habit of speech: *Liexganes*, *pan*, *vino*, *tobacco*, were all the words that he spoke, and these not to the purpose. His two brothers were then alive, and Don Thomas, the elder, was a priest. After nine years he disappeared again, and was never seen, that we know, any more." Thus far the account of Francis de la Vega.

" In the same paper, Macanaz makes mention of Nicholas of Catania, in Sicily, who was wont to swim round that island, and to carry messages all around in that manner.

" He also mentions a woman, who was found on the coast of West Friezeland, in the year 1430, and could never be taught more than to eat as we do, and to spin.

He

From the facts related in this Spanish work, joined with what I have published concerning mermaids*, it appears, that the human body is wonderfully adapted for every use, to which we can conceive it applicable: For he is not a land animal only, but likewise a sea animal; at least he may make himself so. And when he is so made, he is more truly amphibious than any other animal we know, as he can live wholly either on the land or in the water, which no other animal, we call amphibious, can do.

Man, therefore, is superior in body to all other animals, as well as in mind: But he is so much a creature of art, that without art he has not the perfect use even of his own body. Till he had acquired that, he could not provide properly for his own nourishment, of which he required a great deal, being, in his original state, a large animal, without disease, long lived, and all employed in the great work of nature, the propagation of the species. At first, I
am

* He likewise says, that a man, to whom they gave the name of Joseph Urfino, was caught in the woods of Lithuania, but could never be taught to speak. He was found with bears.

" Finally he tells us, that about the year 1723, one of the inhabitants of Navarren, a town of Bearne in the south of France, when hunting in the Pirenean mountains, caught a wild man, and endeavoured to tame him. He staid in a place called Ornes, and although they brought him to eat of whatever others eat; yet, when he came to the fields where they were, he devoured ears of wheat, as if they had been cherries; but they could not teach him to speak. It was intended to carry him to the Regent, Duke of Orleans; but when those that kept him heard of the regent's death, they became something more careless in watching him, so that he escaped, nor could they ever again find him. He was in every respect like to other men in his body, and it was thought that he was the son of a miller of a place called Compagna, who was dead, and who had a son that had disappeared some years before.

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 254.

am persuaded, men lived upon the herbs and roots which the earth produced. And indeed, men in the first stage of their natural state, when they walked upon all four, could not support themselves otherwise; for I do not think that at first they would seek food from the trees; and accordingly it is recorded that Pelasgus first taught the Arcadians to feed on acorns. Peter the *Wild Boy*, while he was a quadruped in the woods of Hanover, fed upon grasses, and the moss of trees. This account we have of him from Hanover, immediately after he was caught*. — And not only can perfect savages live in that way; but even men in the civilized life†. But when men increased very much in number, which they certainly did in the first ages of society, the natural fruits of the earth could not maintain them. And therefore,

———— cum.

* See vol. III of this work, p. 58.

† Appian, *De Bellis Punicis*, p. 6. and 63. *in fine*, as marked upon the margin of the Latin translation of the Amsterdam edition. In the last quoted passage, speaking of the Numidians, he has these words, τα πολλὰ τοῖς νουμιδοῖς πρὸς φαγοῦνται, διὰ τὸ ἀγροῦνται; which explains the reason why they fed upon grass. Diodorus Siculus, lib. 3. cap. 23. where he gives an account of a people in Ethiopia, who live entirely upon the roots of reeds, that grow in the marshes. See a great deal more upon this subject, which I have collected in vol. III. of this work, p. 371. and following; to which I may add the example of a man from Shetland, who died within these two or three years. His name was *Magnus Graham*. He was employed by the Hudson's Bay Company, and lost his way in that country, among the woods, where he remained for about six months, and had nothing to feed upon all that while, but any wild fruits he could find, which could not be many in so cold a country, and the bark of the pine tree, which was his chief subsistence. Upon this diet he lived all the time I have mentioned, and when he at last found his way back to the factory, he was lean indeed, but in very good health. This account I had from a gentleman who knew him very well, and told me upon what occasion he was wandering in the woods, when he lost his way, and by what accident he got back again to the factory; but these particulars it is unnecessary here to relate.

— cum jam glandes atque arbuta sacrae
Deficerent sylvae, et victum Dodona negaret,

then, and not till then, they took to hunting and fishing; for a flesh or fish diet I hold to be unnatural to man, as unnatural as to an horse or ox*. But so pliable is the human constitution, that he can suit himself to it, and even become very fond of it; and it was fit that he should be such an animal, as he was destined, by God and Nature, to spread all over the earth, and to live in every country and climate of it.

That man, before he took to agriculture, lived upon the natural fruits of the earth, and by hunting and fishing, is well known to those who have studied the history of man in antient books. Diodorus Siculus† has given us an account of many savage nations in India, and upon the coasts of the Red Sea, who lived altogether upon the natural fruits of the earth, or upon hunting and fishing, which they practised in many different ways, some of them very extraordinary; and I think this is a very curious and entertaining part of his work, which is preserved to us, as it shews us that man, in his diet and manner of life, as well as in other respects, is the most various animal on this earth. But it is not necessary that we should go to antient books, to be informed that man can live in that way, and even prefer it to the life of agriculture: For a great part of the Tartars at this day live in that way, travelling in hords from place to place in search of food; and it is an execration among them, That a man may be condemned to live in one place, and to labour like a Russian. But in this nomad life, men could have no regular polity, nor be governed

* That it was necessity which first drove men to this unnatural diet, is the opinion of Plutarch, *περί ταρακοφωγίας*, p. 456. edit. Froben.

† Book 3d. cap. 15. and following.

governed by laws. For that purpose it was necessary that they should have a fixed habitation, and live together, in considerable numbers, in one place, for which agriculture is absolutely necessary; and therefore Ceres was very properly said, not only to be the goddess of agriculture, but of laws; and for that reason she was called *Θερμώπρις* *. Without such a life, by which men have the closest intercourse and communication, they could not have invented any arts and sciences worth mentioning, and consequently could not have made that progress in the recovery from their fallen state, which, by God and Nature, they are destined to make even in this life. But in order to qualify man to live in that state of society, the use of language was absolutely necessary, an art, without which there could have been neither sciences nor arts of any value, nor civility or regular government among men. The practice of this art belongs to the subject of which I am treating in this chapter; I mean the use of the organs of the human body. But they are organs infinitely more delicate than the arms and legs, which are the only organs I have hitherto mentioned, being very much smaller, and concealed, for the greater part, in the mouth; nor is the use of them prompted by nature so much as that of those other two. As Language is an art of the greatest use, and which may be said to have made man such as we see him, and as it is at the same time of most difficult invention, and yet must have been the first art of any consequence invented by man, being, as I have said, the foundation of all other arts, I think it is not possible that man, without some supernatural assistance, could have invented an art, of which even the practice, after it is invented, is very difficult to be learned, and can hardly be learned

VOL. IV.

F

at

* Diodorus, lib. 5. cap. 68. and cap. 5. In which last passage he makes a very proper eulogium upon her, where he says, "that there could not be a greater beneficence to men, than what she bestowed upon them; for she not only gave them the means of life, but taught them how to live properly."

at all, except in our earliest and most docile years. But of the invention and perfection of this art, which is so capital a part of the history of man, I will say a great deal more in the sequel. In the mean time I will proceed to give an account of *man* in this second stage of his natural state, after he is erected, and has got the use of his hands and feet, but before he has learned the use of language, or of laws and government.

CHAP.

C H A P. IV.

Of the habitation of man in the natural state.—It was in caves, which nature furnished, or which he dug out of the rocks.—This proved by the authority of antient authors—and monuments still existing.—Man as various in the form of his body, as in any thing else.—Of men with tails.—Of Satyrs, with feet of goats, and with horns upon their heads.—This proved by the testimony of St. Jerome.—Of men without heads, but with eyes in their breasts;—and of men with only one eye in their forehead.—These facts attested by St. Augustine.—Of men with the heads of dogs—proved by the testimony of several authors.—Of the Sphynx.—The existence of such an animal only attested by Agartharchides.—This author had a very good opportunity of being informed.—His work is extant, and bears no mark of fable or romance.—No proof that such animals did never exist, that they are not now to be found.—Reason why they should have ceased to exist.—The wonderful variety of the outward form of man, as well as of his inward form.—Of the variety of the size of men in different ages and different nations of the world.—The civilized life makes a great difference in this respect.—But there is a difference also in the natural state.—This proved by the example of the Ourang Outang.

THAT man is more various, in his diet and manner of life, than any other animal, so various, that he is both a land and a sea animal, I think I have proved in the preceding chapter. A shelter from the weather, and an habitation at land, Nature furnished him, while in the state of nature, as well as his food; for he was protect-

ed from the injuries of the weather by thickets, rocks, and caves. In caves the Cyclops, as Homer tells us, lived; and in the same way, says Dionysius, lived the Curetes in Crete*. The antient inhabitants of Italy lived in the hollows of trees; and the New Hollanders do the same at this day †. This last mentioned habitation Nature has provided for man, and also caves in many places: As to these, where Nature did not furnish them, men have supplied the want by labour and art. Diodorus tells us, that in his time the inhabitants of the Balearic Islands dwelt in caves which they dug out of the rocks ‡. But before men could do this, they must have made some progress towards a life of civility and arts; for at first I am persuaded, they used no other protection against the weather, but such as the brutes use; that is, what nature has provided. When that was found not sufficient, it was very natural that men should make to themselves habitations in the rocks, or under ground, before they learned to raise above ground that artificial habitation we call a house. And I am persuaded, that those excavations of rocks that are to be seen in Abyssinia, and other parts of the world, and particularly in the island of Elephantis, off the coast of Bombay, where there are to be seen, not only single houses, but little cities and streets, all cut out of the rocks §, were all the original habitations of men.

That

* Lib. 5. cap. 65.

† Vol. III. of this work, p. 83.

‡ Diodorus, cap. 17.

§ See vol. III. of this work, p. 83. and 84. The same excavations of rocks are to be seen in another island, called *Salset*, near to Goa. See Letters upon the Origin of the Sciences, p. 312. addressed to M. Voltaire by M. Bailly, printed in 1777. See also Churchill's voyages, vol. 4th, p. 194, where we have, from the famous traveller Gemelli, an account of the excavations in the island of *Salset*. We have an account, likewise, of those of Elephantis, from Hamilton's New Account of the East Indies, vol. 1st. chap. 22. p. 241. See also Bryant's Mythology, vol. 3d. p.

That clothes, as well as houses, were the inventions of art, and not used by man in his natural state, I hold to be certain. Our sacred books have told us, that the first men were naked, as the inhabitants of the Ladrone and Pelew Islands are at this day. And the same books tell us, that the first clothing of men was skins, such as the inhabitants of Terra del Fuego, and many other barbarous nations, wear at present.

Nor is man less various in the figure of his body, than in the other things I have mentioned; and the individuals of the species are, I am persuaded, more different one from another than those of any other species. And first, that there are men with tails, such as dogs and cats have, I think I have proved beyond the possibility of doubt*. And not only are there tailed men extant; but men, such as the antients describe Satyrs, have been found, who had not only tails, but the feet of goats, and horns on their heads. One of this kind, we are told by St. Jerome, was, under the reign of Constantine the Emperor, publicly shewn in Alexandria, while he was alive; and after he was dead, his body was preserved with salt, carried to Antioch, and there shewn to the Emperor†:

So

561. 562. There are likewise to be seen in Upper Egypt, near to Thebes, *Synges*, consisting of many passages, which lead to a variety of apartments. See Ammiannus Marcellinus, lib. 22. p. 263. And there were in that part of Judea called Galilee, *Subterraneus*, where dwelt great numbers of men, as Josephus informs us, lib. 14. cap. 15. See also, upon this subject, Bryant's Mythology, vol. 3d, p. 502, 503.

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, 2d. edit. p. 257. and following; and vol. III. of this work, p. 250. Besides these authorities, there is one Wolfe, a German, who travelled in the island of Ceylon, and who says, that one of the titles of the King of that island, is *Descendant of the Tailed Monarch*.

† Tome 1. of St. Jerome's Works.

So that we ought not to treat as a fable, what the antients have told us of animals of that form*.

We have the authority of another father of the church, for a greater singularity still of the human form; and that is, of men without heads, but with eyes in their breasts. This is related by St. Augustine, who saw these men in Ethiopia, whether he went to preach the gospel; and was some time among them, and relates several other particulars concerning them †. And the same saint tells us, that he saw, in the same country, men with only one eye in their forehead ‡. Nor do these facts rest solely upon the authority of St. Augustine; but antient authors mention them, particularly Strabo, who tells the story of men with eyes in their breasts, which he says is attested by several authors whom he names, though he does not believe them. As to the men with one eye, it is related by Herodotus, of a people in Scythia, who, from that quality, had their name of *Arimaspians*, as he interprets the word §. We must not therefore treat as a fable what Homer has told us of the Cyclops, any more than what is related, by other antient authors, of Satyrs.

There is another singularity of the human form, as great or greater than any I have hitherto mentioned, and that is, of men with the heads of dogs. That such men did exist, is attested by the authors I have elsewhere mentioned ||, whose authorities cannot, I think,

* See vol. III. of this work, p. 250. where Pausanias is quoted giving an account of Satyrs, which he had from one Euphemus, who was an eye witness of what he related.

† Vol. III. of this work, p. 252.

‡ Ibid. p. 253.

§ Ibid. p. 252.—253.

|| Ibid. p. 263. and 264.

think, be questioned. One of them, by name Agatharchides, says, that they were to be seen in Alexandria in his time, having been sent thither from Ethiopia and the country of the Troglodites. So that it appears, that the *Latrator Anubis*, as Virgil calls him, which was the form of one of the Egyptian gods, was not an imaginary form, but taken from real life.

This author, Agatharchides, mentions another animal of mixed form, having the head of a man and the body of a lion, such as he is represented in ancient sculpture, and is called a Sphynx. He says he was sent to Alexandria from Ethiopia, with the dog-headed man above mentioned. And he describes him to be, by nature, a tame and gentle animal, and capable of being taught motion to music; whereas the dog-headed men, he says, were exceedingly fierce, and very difficult to be tamed*. According, therefore, to this author, the sphynx was no imaginary animal, but had a real existence, as well as the dog-headed men. Agatharchides, however, is the only author, as far as I know, who mentions the sphynx, as an animal actually existing; whereas the dog-headed men are mentioned by several other authors. It may be observed, however, that Agatharchides had an opportunity of being very well informed; for he lived about the time of Ptolemy, III. king of Egypt, who had a great curiosity to be informed about the wild men of Ethiopia, and for that purpose sent men to that country, particularly one Symmias, from whom Agatharchides got his information†. And I am disposed to believe that he was well informed; for I have read his book, and I think it has all the appearance of being an authentic narrative, without any mixture of fable, unless we are disposed to believe, that there never existed, on this earth, men different from those we see now.

But

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 264.

† Ibid. p. 50.

But the variety of nature is so great, that I am convinced of the truth of what Aristotle says, that every thing exists, or did at some time exist, which is possible to exist*. And though it were certain that such animals as the sphinx, or the other animals that I have mentioned, did no longer exist on this earth, it would not from thence follow, that they never existed. I do not believe that men with eyes in their breasts, or with only one eye in their forehead, are now to be found on the face of the earth: And yet I think we cannot doubt that they once existed in Ethiopia, where St. Augustine says he saw them. We are sure that there are whole specieses of animals, which were once in certain countries, but are not now to be found there, such as wolves in Britain. It is not probable that such compounded animals, as the dog-headed man and the sphynx, were ever very numerous; and if so, it is likely that they would be considered as monsters by the other men of the country, and so would be destroyed by them†.

Besides these varieties in the whole form of man, there is a variety in one part of him, which I think wonderful, though, as it is so familiar to us, it be not commonly observed. The part I mean is the face, in which a man may observe, in a crowd of people, or walking the streets of a populous city, such a variety of form, and figure, and features expressing different dispositions and sentiments, as is really wonderful.

Thus I think I have shewn, that man is more various in the form of his body, than in any thing else; and that there is a peculiarity

* See what I have said in explanation of this maxim, in vol. III. of this work, p. 261.

† Vol. III. of this work, p. 263.

in the form of some of the individuals of the species, which is not to be found in any other species; I mean the mixture of different specieses in the same animal. And yet I think it is not unnatural, if we consider how much his inward part or mind is compounded; for it consists not only of the vegetable and the animal life, but of the intellectual; and if so, I think it needs not be wondered, that his nature should admit of a composition likewise, in his outward form, of different specieses of animals.

As to the size and stature of men in the different ages and nations, it would be indeed extraordinary, if in an animal, the most various upon this earth, there was not found the common variety of great and small, a variety which, I believe, is to be found in every other animal on this earth. That such a variety does in fact exist in our species, I think I have proved beyond all doubt in the third volume of this work *, where I have shewn, that not only in different nations there is a great difference of size, but in the same nation in different ages; and that it is in the natural state that men are larger in body, stronger, and longer lived: And it is a truth of reason and philosophy, as well as of fact and observation; for the ease, indulgence, and luxury of the civilized life, together with the unnatural diet, and all these continued through many generations, must necessarily produce a great degeneracy in the size, strength, and longevity of men; unless we believe, that man could invent a way of living more conducive to the health and strength of his body, than that which God and Nature have destined for him. If we should not be convinced by the testimony of profane authors, our sacred books furnish us demonstrative proof; for they tell us, that before the Flood, when men lived upon vegetables, that is, upon the natu-

VOL. IV.

G

ral

* Page 135. and following.

ral diet, they were very much longer lived than after the Flood, when they fed upon flesh, and consequently more healthy, and of greater size and strength. And I hold that they have been degenerating ever since, and still continue to degenerate; which every man, who has lived so long as I, may observe: For I am now living, as Nestor lived, with the third generation; and I can say with him, 'That I have seen such men as I do not now see, 'nor ever expect to see*.' And I think I can add, as Nestor does, 'That with such men I lived and conversed.' And the same poet tells us, from the mouth of the Goddess of Wisdom, 'That the children 'now are not like their fathers†.' A learned Roman, Solinus Polyhistor, asks the question, *Quis enim jam aevo nostro non minor parentibus suis nascitur?* To these testimonies may be added, that of the Greek philosopher Empedocles, who says, 'That the men of his 'time were of the size of children, compared with antient men‡.' Who would desire to know more of the degeneracy of men, in size and strength, may consult a book written by one Hermannus Conringius, a German, entitled *De Habitus Corporum Germanicorum, antiqui ac Novi, Causis*, where he will find many curious facts concerning the stature of men, and a great deal concerning giants, who appear not only to have been in the land of Canaan, but in the northern parts of Europe, and indeed in every country in the world, of whose antient

* Οὐ γὰρ πῦ τοιους ἰδὼν ἀνδρας, οὐδὲ ἰδῶμαι,
 'Οἷοι Πιερίδων τε, Δρυοπτὰ τε, ποιμένα λαῶν,
 Κούρη τ', Εὐχέδωι τε, καὶ Ἀττίδωι Παλοφῶνι,
 Θούρη τ' Αἰγυΐδῃ, ἐπὶ κελύφῃ ἀβυσσότησι.

Iliad I. v. 262.

† Οὐ γὰρ τοὶ παῖδες ὅμοιοι πατρὶ πύλονται,
 'Οἱ πλείους κακίους, παῦροι τε δὲ πατέρος ἀρίστους.

Odyss. II. v. 273.

‡ Plutarchus, *De Placitis Philosophorum*, in the end of that work.

antient history we are well informed. And it appears to me, that in all countries there have been, in very antient times, a race of wild men of extraordinary stature, the remains of which continued in some families down to later times. Of the monuments of such men there are many existing in different parts of the world; and particularly there are, in the north of Europe, works that it is impossible could be executed by men such as we.

But we are not to imagine, that it is only the civilized life that makes the difference of the stature of men. In the natural state there is a great difference; for of the Ourang Outangs, who are certainly in the natural state, there are three kinds, very different in their size. The first, which are called Pongos or Impongos, are of very great size, betwixt seven and nine feet high, and prodigiously strong. The third class of the Ourang Outangs, or Chimpenza, as they are called, are only about the height of five or six feet when they are erected. And the middle kind, or Itzena, as they are called, are greater than the Chimpenza, but less than the Pongo*: And that there were pigmies to be found in other parts of the world, as well as among the Ourang Outangs, I think I have proved very clearly in the third volume of this work†.

After man had learned all the uses to which his body could be applied, and had made himself a sea animal as well as a land, so that he was in every respect the most various animal upon this earth, I think it cannot be denied, that he was superior to all other animals here below in bodily faculties: And I will only add, that he has from nature a strength of constitution, such as no other animal we know has: For, in the first place, he can subsist upon every thing

G 2

the

* See vol. III of this work, p. 281.—289.

† Ibid. p. 136.

the earth produces, even the grafs of the fields* ; and not only upon the fruits of trees, but upon their barks ; and he can live in all climates of the earth, and endure the greateft extremities both of heat and cold †. But what I think fhews the ftrength of his conftitution more than any thing I have mentioned, is the life of many people of fafhion in great towns, particularly in London, who not only feed upon what I call an unnatural diet, that is flefh, and drink ftrong liquors, but ufe fire, which, as Horace fays, has brought upon the earth a cohort (he might have faid a legion) of difeafes. And not only do they not work off the effects of this unnatural life by any exercife worth mentioning ; but they do not even enjoy the common benefit of air, at leaft of a pure uncorrupted air ; for if fuch an air was to be got in a city like London, where the fuel ufed muft neceffarily fill the air with fulphureous vapours, they do not go out to feek it. When they fay they go *out*, they truly go *in*, as they do not walk the ftreets, but ufe clofe carriages, in which they may be faid to be poisoned by their own breath. And if fuch be the life of the people of fafhion in London, how much worfe muft the life of the vulgar be, who befides praftifing arts very unfavourable to health, ufe a drink the moft pernicious of all the things which the art of man

* Appian, *De Bellis Punicis*, p. 6. & 63. *in fine*. Herodotus, lib. 3. cap. 28. lib. 8. cap. 115.

† There is a book written upon this fubject by a German of the name of Zimmerman, entitled, *Zoographie Geographique*, where he tells us, that man can live where the mercury falls 126 degrees below Zero, according to Fahrenheit's thermometer, which is the greateft cold that art can produce by the mixture of fal amoniac and ice. This cold, he fays, the bears in Nova Zembla cannot bear, nor any other animal, except man and the white fox. And he tells us, that in Greenland the men have their bodies very flightly covered, their head and neck quite uncovered, and no fires in their huts. As to heat, he relates, upon the authority of a French academician, that women can work in an oven heated to the degree of 275, by the fame thermometer, which the academician fays he faw.

man has invented for his own destruction, I mean spirituous liquors, which, so far from being fit for the drink of any animal, are fuel for fire, producing a quick and violent flame. The being able to endure such a life for any number of years, and without that regimen which the antients used constantly for the preservation of their health, I mean bathing, anointing, and friction with a kind of curry-comb, which they called *Strigil*, shews, in my opinion, a greater strength of constitution than that of the inhabitants of an island a degree farther south than the Straits of Magellan, whom Sir Francis Drake saw quite naked; or than the inhabitants of Terra del Fuego, who are very slightly clothed, wearing nothing but skins loosely tacked about them, and yet have no disease, as far as we know, except blear eyes, which they have got from hanging over the fire, the use of which they appear to have learned from some of the nations upon the continent, and in that respect were more unfortunate than the inhabitants of the Ladrone Islands, or of the country from which the savage girl, whom I saw in France, came.

That this way of living must shorten life, is evident. But what I think much worse, it makes that short life end with a long and miserable death: For such men are nine years a killing, the death that Othello in the Play wishes that Cassio may die. And I have known some of them, that were 20 years a killing by doctors and apothecaries; a death infinitely more miserable than that of Damien, which lasted only one day.

C H A P. V.

Of the character of man in his natural state,—Not known what his character was in the first stage of that state, when he was a quadruped;—but from what we know of the Ourang Outang, man in the second stage of his progression, is a social, friendly animal, and capable of intellect and science.—To judge of a man in the civilized state, after he has got the use of language, a distinction is to be made betwixt those who live by hunting, and those who subsist upon the fruits of the earth.—The inhabitants of the Pelew Islands a specimen of what men are in the first state of civilization, and before they are hunters.—The wrong construction given by some men to the behaviour of the inhabitants of the Pelew Islands towards us.—The behaviour of the New Zealanders as noble and generous as that of the Pelew men.—A remarkable instance of their behaviour given.

HAVING said so much of the body of man in his natural state, I think it will be proper to say something of his mind. It is by mind, chiefly, as Aristotle has observed, that the several specieses of animals are distinguished from one another. And the several states of an animal, of such wonderful progression as man, must be marked by a great difference of character or disposition of mind.

What the mind of man was, while he was a quadruped, we cannot, from fact or experience, determine with any certainty, as so few

few examples have been found of men living in that state. But I think we may guess what his character was, from what we know of him after he was erected, but without the use of speech; and also from what we know of him in the first ages of civility, after he had learned to speak. And first, there is the Orang Outang, who has not the use of speech, but is of a character mild and gentle, affectionate too, and capable of friendship and attachment to particular persons, with the sense also of what is decent and becoming. He is social too, and lives in herds; so that with regard to his character, he is undoubtedly a man, and a much better man than many that are to be found in civilized countries. And as to his capacity of intellect and science, he has I think shewn, by the arts, few as they are, which he has invented, (such as that of arming himself with a weapon, and erecting huts to protect him from the weather), but which are as many as could well be expected that he should have invented in his state of life, that he is not defective in the capacity of intellect and science.

As to nations in the first ages of civility, we must make a distinction betwixt men living upon the natural fruits of the earth, and those who subsist by hunting and feed on flesh, which changes the natural character of man, and makes him not only more cruel and ferocious, but also more cunning and deceitful than he would otherwise be; for it is by cunning and surprise that he seizes his prey. To discover, therefore, what man by nature is in the first age of civility, before he becomes a hunter, we must go to the Pelew Islands, a discovery lately made, which I think of great value. There we find men, that are not only kind and hospitable, but generous and noble minded: So that when they go to war, they scorn to make it by stratagem and surprise; but fairly tell their enemy when and where they are to attack them.

There:

There are some, I know, who think that their hospitality and kindness to us, was only a device to lull us into security, that they might have an opportunity of murdering us, and seizing our iron tools, of which they were very fond, and the other instruments of art which we used. But, as Mr Pope says,

—— I who think more highly of our kind,
(And surely heaven and I are of a mind),

believe, that their behaviour to us proceeded from that worth and goodness which is natural to man. Nor indeed can I be persuaded, that they would act so nobly, and with such heroic greatness of mind to their profest enemies, and behave so basely and treacherously to us, whom they had received so kindly and hospitably, and with whom they were living in the greatest friendship and confidence*.

There

* There is an account of this people published by Mr Keate, which is one of the most entertaining books I ever read. I have done it an honour which I have done very few modern books; for I have read it twice, and both times with very great pleasure and instruction. It presents a most agreeable picture of human nature in the first ages of society, uncorrupted by the crimes and vices of such societies as those of Europe are at present. And it confirms me in an opinion which I have always had, but which was never before so verified by fact and experience, that man is, by his nature, a generous, noble minded animal, full of benevolence and kindness to his species, and most ready to relieve men in distress, though not only altogether strangers, but of a race of men entirely different from them, and such as they had never seen before. They are brave and magnanimous, ready to encounter danger and death upon all occasions for their country and their friends, and at the same time living in the greatest peace and good order with one another, under a government which, as it is most natural, so I think it is the best, by a king, a council, and an order of nobles, out of which the council and the great officers of state are chosen.

Our

There is another people, who, like the inhabitants of the Pelew islands, having no four footed animals in their country, are not hunters;

Our people lived thirteen weeks among them, and in close intercourse with them, and had an opportunity, during that time, to see their behaviour, not only in peace, but in war, in which they accompanied them and assisted them; and during that time, it does not appear that they discovered any crime, vice, or folly among them; but on the contrary, found them possessed of every virtue and every amiable quality, with a politeness and delicacy of sentiment which could not have been believed, if it were not so well attested. They verify the truth of an observation made by Aristotle, "That the love of knowledge is natural to man," though it be a passion which, according to my observation, is one of the weakest among us: For they shewed a love of knowledge, and a desire to be instructed in all our arts, which was really surprising, and was most eminent (among other eminent qualities), in that young man the king's son, whom they carried with them, and who, if he had lived, would, I am persuaded, have done the greatest honour to his nation, and to human kind. They live in the most natural way, in so far that they wear no clothes, eat very little flesh, use no strong liquors at all, but live almost altogether upon the fruits of the earth, such as yams and cocoa nuts. At the same time they bathe, and anoint with oil; both which are practised by so many different nations, both savage and civilized, that I believe they are arts for preserving health, which instinct directs men to practice. But as they depart so far from nature, as to live in houses and to use fire, they are liable to some diseases, particularly those of the scrophulous kind.

As to the stile of this work, I should like it much better if it were more simple, and with less affectation of ornament. But I observe, that what Mr Keate has put into the mouth of the king of Pelew, or of his officers, is excellent, not only for the matter, but for the style, which is perfectly plain and natural; such as what he makes the king say upon occasion of the suspicions of him which the English might entertain, (p. 249. of the third edition), and what his general says in defence of the English, (p. 221.). And indeed it would have been most absurd, to have made men, doing every thing in so natural a way, speak in the florid style of Mr Gibbons. I can, however, pardon him for the use of that style, in his declamations upon the philanthropy of the Pelew men, which was really wonderful. But the speeches I have mentioned, I am persuaded, he does not write in his own stile, but gives them, both matter and stile, as Captain Wilson had them from the interpreter.

hunters ; I mean the New Zealanders. They shew a spirit as noble and generous as the men of the Pelew Islands. I was assured, by a man who accompanied Captain Cook in that expedition, and who is now our consul at Morrocco, *Mr Mattra*, that, while we were at war with them, they scorned to attack any small party of our men with any great number of their own. And Dr Solander, now dead, who attended Captain Cook in that expedition, told me a story of them, of which Sir Joseph Banks is still a living witness. He said, while they were yet in terms of hostility with the New Zealanders, Sir Joseph and he went to a little island off the coast of New Zealand to botanize, which the New Zealanders observing, set off in their canoe, in order to intercept them ; to prevent which, our people set out with their long boat. But the canoe got to the island before the boat, and laid hold of Sir Joseph and Dr Solander, who gave themselves up for lost. And Sir Joseph, he told me, had his hand at his pistol, resolved to sell his life as dear as he could. But those savages, as we call them, were so generous and noble minded, that they did not offer the least violence to them, but waiting till their countrymen came up to them, put them into their hands, and then bid them defend themselves, as the Otaheite man, who was with them, interpreted their words. Upon this they made a very fierce attack upon our people, who were obliged to kill some of them before they could beat them off.

Many other examples might be given of the good dispositions of
men

I will conclude this long note with observing, that it is not much to be wondered, that our people, considering the situation they were in, should be very suspicious of treachery on the Pelew men. It was very natural for them to judge of the character of these people, by that of the men among whom they had lived ; and it was a very high compliment they paid to the Pelew men, to believe their generosity and noble behaviour incredible, when they had such temptation to act a contrary part.

men in the first ages of civil life. The people of Hispaniola, when the Spaniards first came among them, were, as we are informed by Charlevoix, a humane, kind, and hospitable people; and without citing more examples, I believe it to be true what Captain Cook said to the late Sir John Pringle, ' That all those we call savages, among whom he was, were kind and hospitable, (unless where they were provoked, by ill treatment, to be otherwise), with the highest sense of what is honourable and praise-worthy.'

C H A P. VI.

Of the progress of man from a natural state, to a state of civility and arts.—Such a progress absolutely necessary.—The first step of this progress was living in herds.—Of the motives which induced men to live in that way.—Animals divided, by Aristotle, into gregarious and not gregarious;—and into political and not political.—Man of the mixed kind—both gregarious and solitary; political and not political.—Man not induced to associate by instinct, or any particular attachment to his species—proved that he has no such attachment.—It was therefore necessity or convenience that made him associate.—This the case of the Ourang Outang.—Men in that state lived like brutes, though they were both gregarious and political.—Examples of other animals living in that way.—That way of living far removed from a state of civility and arts.—Language absolutely necessary to form such a state.—Man must have formed ideas before he can have the use of speech.—Language a wonderful art, but the formation of ideas more wonderful.—The formation of ideas our first step from the mere animal life.—This is a most difficult step, being from nature, where all things are mixed with all.—The progress of ideas, from the lowest species to the highest genus.—We discover differences of things, and divide as well as unite.—Of the Categories, by which the whole things in the Universe are reduced to certain classes.—This the greatest discovery of philosophy that ever was made.—But the human mind goes beyond the Categories, and discovers what contains the Categories, and every thing in the Universe.—This progress most wonderful, from what is lowest in nature to what is highest.—Language necessary for that progress.—Therefore it is the parent art of all arts and sciences.

HAV-

HAVING said so much of man in his natural state, I proceed to consider him in a state of civility and arts, beginning with his progress from the natural to that state; for that there must have been a progress, and that he did not become at once an animal of civility and arts, is what no person can doubt, who knows any thing of the history or philosophy of man; or if he be so ignorant of that history and philosophy, as to have any doubt in the matter, I think what I have said in the first volume of the origin of language may satisfy him.

The first step in this progress must have been *associating*, or *living together in herds*, as the Ourang Outangs do at present, and as many people of the antient world did*; and the first thing to be considered is, What prompted man to live in that way? Was it instinct, such as prompts cattle and sheep to herd together; or was it some motive of necessity or convenience?

Aristotle has divided animals, very properly, into gregarious and solitary, and some that partake of both kinds; and the gregarious he has subdivided into political and not political. The political he defines to be those who carry on some common work, that is, a work for behoof of the whole herd; whereas those, who are not political, carry on no common work, and therefore have no bond of union, though they herd and live together†. Man, he says, is that kind of animal, which is neither altogether gregarious nor altogether solitary, but participates of both. So that here we may observe another variety in our species, not hitherto mentioned,
by

* Origin of Language, vol. I. book 2. chap. 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7.

† This division of animals I have explained in the second chapter of the second book of the first volume of the Origin of Language, where I have also corrected the text of Aristotle.

by which he is both social and not social : So that man appears to be made up of contradictions ; for he has intellect, and he has not intellect ; he is a biped, and he is not a biped ; he is a land animal, and he is not a land animal ; he is a water animal, and not a water animal ; and, among other varieties, he is, according to Aristotle, gregarious, and not gregarious ; to which may be added, political, and not political. He is therefore as much mixed in mind, as I have shewn that he is in body ; so that he can hardly be said to be one species of animals, but a compound of all specieses.

That man can live in the solitary state, is proved by many examples of solitary savages that have been found : And that in such a state he has no instinct or inclination which prompts him to associate with his fellow creatures, is evident from this, that these solitary savages, when they are first discovered, run away from men, which was the case particularly of the savages that were discovered in the Pyrenean mountains* : For that by nature and instinct we have not that attachment to our species, which other animals have is evident, from a peculiarity of man that I have not yet mentioned, namely, that he is the only land animal that feeds upon his own species, and prefers that food to any other. This I have elsewhere very clearly proved †. It was therefore some reason of convenience

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 46. and 47.

† Origin and Progress of Language, vol. I. p. 227, 228, and 229. in the note. Nor does this contradict what I have said of the worth and goodness of the people of the Pelew Islands ; for the New Zealanders are as generous and noble minded a people as those of Pelew, yet they eat their enemies. And the fact is, that when men have once got a taste of animal food, they become very fond of it, as we see men among us are very fond of many things still more unnatural than the flesh diet, such as tobacco and spirits. But men, farther advanced in civility and arts than the

venience or necessity that first made men herd together. The Ourang Outangs associate for the same reason that they are armed with a stick ; that is, to defend themselves against the elephants, and to drive them out of their pasture ; also to fight with the blacks, and with one another, when they quarrel. And as they build huts, they, no doubt, join in companies for that purpose. He is therefore a political animal for the same reason that he is gregarious, that is, for the sake of necessity and convenience.

That men, when they were no farther advanced in the social and political life, lived together in the brutish way, copulating promiscuously, without distinction of families or races, is evident from ancient history *. And indeed men could not be said to be removed from the brutes, when they only herded together, and carried on some work jointly for the behoof of the whole herd ; for there are sundry specieses of brutes that herd together for that purpose, particularly the beaver, an animal which resembles man in this particular, that he can live either by himself or in society ; and is not, by the necessity of his nature, social and political, like the bee or ant †.

Thus

the New Zealanders, will abominate the use of their own species for food, though there are sundry examples of their being driven by necessity to take to it ; and the men, so necessitated, have all agreed with the North Americans, mentioned in the passage quoted in the beginning of this note, that it is the most delicious of all flesh. And it is said, that a lion, that has once tasted human flesh, prefers it to all other : So that here we may see another excellency of our species, that our flesh is a more delicious food than that of any other animal.

* Origin of Language, vol. I. book 2d. chap. 3d.

† Ibid. p. 417. and following, where there are examples given of other animals living in the same way.

Thus far, therefore, man is advanced from the solitary savage, so as not only to be gregarious, but even political, in Aristotle's sense of the word. But he is still far removed from that state of civility, which is absolutely necessary for the invention and cultivation of arts and sciences, by which only he can make any progress in this life, towards regaining the state from which he has fallen. For that purpose, a regular polity must be formed, and properly carried on. Now, this cannot be done without language, which, I think, I have shewn clearly, is not from nature, but more a thing of art, than any other thing among men. Language, therefore, may be said to be the foundation of all arts and sciences: For it is only by that communication among men, which language bestows upon them, that any art worth mentioning, or science, can be invented or cultivated; for though men may herd together, and carry on some joint work, by inarticulate cries, or by signs and gestures, as the beavers do *, it is impossible that without language they can have any thing that can be called government, or become an animal of intellect, not in capacity merely, but in energy and actuality. But men, before they could have the use of language, must have formed ideas to be expressed by words; for a language, having only names for individual objects perceived by the senses, would not deserve the name, nor afford the use of a language.

That language is a wonderful invention, every scholar, and indeed every man of sense and observation, must know. This even a savage of North America knew, who, in conversation with a missionary, acknowledged that the Europeans had much more wit than they; 'But,' says he, 'has any of you invented a language †?' But that

* Origin and Progress of Language, vol. I. p. 417.

† Ibid. p. 566.

that operation of our minds, by which we form ideas, is still more wonderful. As this is a view in which ideas have never been considered, I will enlarge a little upon it.

To be convinced of this, let us consider that our first step, from the mere animal to the intellectual creature, is the forming of ideas; for it is that which gives us intellect in *actuality*, which, in our natural state, we had only in *capacity*. Now the beginning of all things is the most difficult; and it is particularly so in this case, if we consider, that all our ideas are formed from Nature. Now, what does Nature present to us? It is what may be called a Chaos, where every thing is mixed with every thing, animals, vegetables, and minerals, the elements of earth, water, air, and fire; the heavens above, and the earth below. These are all perceived by our senses, which are our only inlets to knowledge in this state of our existence. But the senses perceive them altogether in the lump, and as they exist in nature; but in order to form ideas of them, we must arrange them, and perceive their several relations and connections. This is done, as I have shewn *, by the two great faculties of the human intellect, abstraction and generalization; that is, by dividing and uniting. As the face of Nature presents to us all things, as I have said, mixed with all, in which way they are perceived by our senses, it is of absolute necessity that they should be divided and considered separately, otherwise it is impossible we can form that distinct notion of them, which we call an idea. And particularly it is necessary, that in forming the idea of any material substance, we should abstract it from the matter. And here there is another essential difference betwixt the idea and the perception of sense, which perceives nothing but what is material in the subject.

VOL. IV.

I

As

* P. 17. of this volume.

As to the uniting, we must perceive what is common to many things, and in that way connect and join the things together, which is called generalization, or, as it is expressed by Plato, perceiving *the one in the many*. By the first operation of division, we see what is principal in any individual thing, and separate it from the other qualities of the thing; and thus considering it by itself, we form the *particular* idea of that individual thing. Then we exercise the other faculty of uniting, by which we discover, that this particular idea is common to many other individuals: And thus, by seeing this one thing in the many, we form the *general* idea of the species, as of a *man*, for example, or a *horse**. But not stopping here, we go on, and find that the one thing, which is common to the man and horse, is common to other things; and thus we form the idea of the genus Animal, where we see *the one* in many more things than we saw it before. From *animal* we ascend to *animated body*, or the *ψυχον*, as the Greeks call it, comprehending both animals and vegetables. And from thence our next step is to *body*, and from *body* to *substance*, which is one of the Categories. And thus we go on discovering *the one* in the *many*, but that *many* always increasing. And while we thus unite things, which seem, at first sight, so remote from one another, perceiving what they have in common, we perceive also in what they differ; and this is what is called the *specific difference*, by which the several specieses of the same genus are distinguished from one another. And while we thus go on, investigating the different relations and connections of things, we discover that some things exist by themselves, while other things have no such

* See what I have said of particular and general ideas, in vol. III. of this work, p. 341. and the passages there quoted; where I have shown the absurdity of supposing that there could be *general* ideas, if there were not *particular*; or that an idea could be abstracted from any corporeal substance, if it did not exist in it: And yet our philosophers, at present, speak of *general* and *abstracted* ideas, as if they were the same.

such independent existence, but exist in other things, and yet of these we form separate ideas; so that, in this formation of ideas, we divide things that are by nature indivisible, such as substances and their accidents, and which, by the senses, are always perceived together. Of *accidents* we form ideas, as well as of *substances*, and by the same process of dividing and uniting. In this way we form the idea of *magnitude* or quantity continuous, and of *number* or quantity discrete, and a more general idea still, that of *quantity*. And in the same manner we form ideas of the qualities of body, such as *figure* and *colour*.

The number of specieses, as well as of individuals, is infinite with respect to us and our comprehension, but not in the nature of things: For as the universe is a system, it can admit of nothing infinite, but every thing must have measure and bounds. But though the specieses be infinite, with respect to us, science has contrived, (and a wonderful work of science it is), to reduce the genuses to certain classes, and to number these classes. This was a discovery of the Pythagorean school, and the greatest discovery, in my opinion, that ever was made in philosophy, by which all the things in this universe are classed and numbered. The work is very properly entitled, by Archytas, the author of it, *Περὶ τοῦ Παντός*, that is, *Of the whole of Things*; but in the Treatise of Aristotle, that we have on the subject, and which is little more than the work of Archytas translated from the Doric to the Attic, it is entitled, *Of the Categories*; for, as he makes it part of his logic, he gives those highest genuses the name of the Praedicates of Propositions*.

This progress of the human mind, from objects of sense, with which

I. 2.

all

* Who would desire to know more of the Universals of Archytas, and the Categories of Aristotle, may read the 3d book of vol. I. of this work, particularly the first three chapters.

all our knowledge in this life must begin, to the universals contained in the Categories, by which, as I have said, we make an arrangement and distribution of all the things in the universe, must appear very wonderful to the philosopher, who considers of what infinite variety those things are, and how mixed and seemingly confused they are presented to the senses. But the human intelligence does not stop even here; for it goes beyond the Categories, and not only perceives an infinite number of things contained in them, but also that which contains the Categories; so that it perceives not only the *one* in many different objects, of number infinite, but it discovers the *one in all*; that is, it discovers *God*; who virtually contains in himself all things of this universe: For, as our sacred books tell us, *all things are in God, and God in all things*. And thus, by a ladder, such as Jacob saw in his dream, reaching from heaven to earth, at the top of which was the Lord*, we ascend, from what is lowest in nature, that is, objects of sense, to what is highest. But to explain this more particularly, belongs to Theology, which is not our subject at present.

I will only add farther, upon the subject of ideas, that every idea we form is a system; for even the particular idea of the individual thing is a system, as we perceive in it what is principal and what is subordinate. The species is a larger system, in which we take in many things, and perceive what they have in common, and how they are connected together. And thus we proceed, from lesser to greater systems, till we comprehend, as far as we are able, the system which comprehends all other systems, I mean the system of the universe, and its Great Author. Thus it appears, that a good logic, which explains accurately the nature of ideas, does lead us, by the most natural progress, up to Theology, in which all science ends: So that it is of the utmost importance to philosophy, that we should learn a logic which teaches us to distinguish betwixt ideas and sensations,

* Genesis, chap. xxviii. v. 13.

tions, and not to confound them, as Mr Locke has done. What I have said here, and elsewhere, I hope will enable every man of common sense to make the distinction, and to perceive, not only that the operation of the mind, by which we form ideas, is perfectly different from the perceptions of sense; but that the objects are quite different; for the intellect, by which we form our ideas, perceives nothing but in system; whereas the sense perceives nothing in that way, but only corporeal objects, not analysed, as they are by the intellect, but altogether in a lump with their several qualities*.

It may be farther observed, that as there can be no system, but of things which have a connection and relation to one another, in forming the several systems of our ideas we perceive all the connections and relations that can be imagined betwixt things: For we perceive the genus, the species, the difference, what is proper or peculiar, and what is accidental, in things; and these comprehend all the several relations of conformity or diversity, in which the things of this universe stand to one another. These are the *five words*, which Porphyry, and his commentator Ammonius Hermias, have so well explained. The work is very properly entitled, by Philoponus, *Εἰσαγωγή*, or *Introduction*, and indeed it is the best introduction to philosophy that ever was written†.

And this superior faculty of our minds, by which we perceive things in system, and in system only, and by which we proceed from lesser to greater systems, should convince us, that we are not destined,

* See what I have said upon this subject, in vol. III. of this work, p. 342. and following, where I have shewn that intellect is as incapable of perceiving the objects of sense, as sense is of perceiving the objects of intellect.

† See what I have farther said of this valuable work, in vol. V. of *Origin of Language*, p. 413.

destined, by God and nature, only to eat and drink in this world; and to enjoy other sensual pleasures, but for a much more noble end; — To contemplate the several systems of which this universe is composed, and the universe itself and its Great Author, the contemplation of which may be called the *Beatific Vision*, being the greatest happiness of which our nature is capable.

This world of ideas, upon which I have enlarged so much, and which may be called *the intellectual world* of our *microcosm*, could never have been formed without the use of language: For, in the first place, we must have had certain signs or marks of our ideas, which would be absolutely necessary for our own use, as without them we could not retain them in our memories, or put them together in propositions. And, *secondly*, we could not otherwise have communicated them to one another. Now it is by communication, in the way of discourse, that all arts and sciences have been invented and cultivated, and regular forms of government framed, under which men might live in peace and good order, and be supplied with all the necessaries of life, so that they might have time to apply to arts and sciences. Language, therefore, may be said to be the parent of all arts and sciences, and to be the first step of that ladder, by which we are to ascend from this earth to that state from which we are fallen.

CHAP.

C H A P. VII.

Of the progress of the human mind from ideas to Science.—Ideas the materials only of Science.—They must be put together in order to make science.—This done by propositions.—All Propositions consist of a praedicate and a subject.—The praedicate the more general idea, containing the subject being the less general idea.—Of the manner in which one idea contains another;—and how the more general idea contains and is contained in the less general.—This explained by the distinction betwixt containing potentially and actually.—This distinction shewn to apply to all propositions, whether praedicating the genus of the species, or the accident of the substance.—Propositions alone not fit for science.—There must be that comparison of propositions, which we call Reasoning.—Where the connection betwixt the two Terms of the proposition is not evident, it must be made so by other propositions.—This cannot go on in infinitum, but must stop at self-evident propositions.—Of the process of reasoning from these propositions, and of the collection of propositions into Syllogism.—Of the wonderful invention of the Syllogism, and of the whole logical works of Aristotle.—Syllogism alone not sufficient for Science.—There must be also Definition.—Of the nature of Definition.—The Terms of propositions may consist of several ideas, expressed by several words.—This illustrated by the example of the first axiom of Euclid.—Definitions, therefore, as well as Axioms, necessary for Science.—Of the utility of Logic, and the necessity that a man, who pretends to be learned in any science, should know what Science is.—Opinion among men, prior to science or demonstration.—All men, when they first begin to think, form Opinions,—and most men never go farther.—Polybius's definition of Man, that he is an opinion-forming

forming animal.—*This not so good a definition as Aristotle's.—Aristotle gives us a system of reasoning from Popular Opinions, which he calls Dialectics; and with this, and his treatise De Sophisticis Elenchis, he concludes his great work of Logic.—Summary of this work.*

BUT before I proceed to speak of the invention of language and other arts, I think it is proper to shew the progress of the human mind from *ideas* to *science*. What ideas are, and how they are formed by intellect, I hope I have explained, to the satisfaction of the reader, in the preceding chapter. But ideas are only the materials of science; and in order to know what science is, we must know how those materials are put together so as to produce science.

The first step from ideas towards science, is Propositions, which are formed, by comparing one idea with another; so that, from the comparative, or Logical faculty, as Aristotle calls it, which we have in common with the better kind of brutes, not only our ideas proceed, but science, and, in general, all the operations of the intellectual mind*. When we compare our ideas, we perceive, as Mr Locke tells us, their agreement or disagreement: But wherein this agreement consists, he has not told us; nor can any man tell, who has not studied the antient philosophy. But that philosophy teaches us, that in every proposition there is one idea more general than another, and that this more general idea either contains or comprehends the less general, or does not: And thus are formed affirmative and negative propositions. The more general idea, which

* See what I have said of this logical or comparative faculty of the human mind, in the first chapter of this volume, and in vol. I. p. 381.

which contains the less general, is called the *Predicate* of the proposition; whereas the less general is called the *Subject*. But this distinction, however obvious, and such, as that, without it, we cannot have so much as the idea of a Proposition, Mr Locke has nowhere made; so totally ignorant he appears to have been of logic*.

But to those, who know no more of logic nor of antiient philosophy than Mr Locke did, it will be necessary to explain in what sense one idea can be said to contain another, or the idea less general can be said to be a part of the more general. And, in the first place, it is not in the sense that one body is said to be a part of another, or the greater body to contain the lesser; nor is it as one number is said to contain another; but it is *virtually* or *potentially* that the more general idea contains the less general. In this way the genus contains the species; for the genus may be predicated of every species under it, whether existing or not existing; so that *virtually* it contains all the specieses under it, which exist or may exist. And not only does the more general contain the less general, but (what at first sight may appear surprising) the less general contains the more general, not *virtually* or *potentially*, but *actually*. Thus the genus Animal contains *virtually* Man, and every other species of animal either existing or that may exist: But the genus Animal is contained in man, and in other animals *actually*; for man cannot exist without being in *actuality*, and not *potentially* only, an animal†.

There are only two ways in which the more general idea of a proposition
Vol. IV. K position

* See what I have further said of Mr Locke's logic, in vol. I. of this work, p. 382. and following.

† See Book V. Chap. II. of vol. I. where this matter is explained at great length, and particularly p. 479. where I have acknowledged that I got the distinction betwixt containing potentially and actually, upon which I think, the whole truth of the Syllogism depends, from a Greek now living, *Eugenius Diaconus*.

position can be predicated of the less general: One of these is, as the genus is predicated of the species, which I have already mentioned. It is called by Aristotle καὶ ὑποκειμένου*. The other Aristotle calls ὑποκειμένου, when an accident is predicated of a substance, which is, when it is affirmed that the accident is inherent in the substance; as when we predicate the colour *white* of *man*. In this case likewise the predicate is a more general idea than the subject, containing not only *man* in the instance given, but every other substance of that colour. And the same distinction will apply of containing *virtually* and *actually*: For *white* contains *man* only *virtually*, but is contained in *man* *actually*; so that what I have said of ideas containing and not containing one another, applies equally to all propositions predicating either the genus of the species, or the accident of the substance; † and this may suffice, as to propositions in general, for our present purpose. Who would desire to know more upon this subject, may consult the fifth book of the first volume of this work, where he will find the whole doctrine of propositions explained on the principles of Antient Philosophy.

But propositions alone will not make science. For suppose that we cannot perceive the connection betwixt the two ideas, in the proposition, nor discover that the one makes part of the other; what is to be done in that case? This Aristotle tells us, and not any other philosopher antient or modern, that I know. We must find out, he says, a third idea, which we must apply to each of the ideas in the proposition, and which, therefore, he very properly calls a middle term; and, in this way, try to discover the connection betwixt the two ideas in the proposition. This operation of the intellect, by which we apply the middle term to the two ideas or terms of the proposition, and by which we form other propositions, is called

* See the beginning of the Book of Categories.

† See, with respect to these two kinds of Predication, vol. I. p. 383.

led in Greek *διαλεκτική*, in Latin *discursus mentis*, and in English *Reasoning*; or, as the Latin expression may not be improperly translated, *Discourse of Reason*. And the way, in which the two terms are connected by the middle term, is this. If the predicate, or greater term of the proposition to be proved, contain the middle term, and if the middle term contain the subject, or lesser term, then the predicate must necessarily contain the subject; and thus an *affirmative* proposition is proved. But, on the other hand, if the predicate do not contain the middle term, but the middle term contain the lesser term of the proposition to be proved, then it is proved that the predicate does not contain the subject; and this is the demonstration of a *negative* proposition.

But suppose two propositions, by which we apply the middle term first to one idea of the proposition to be proved and then to the other, are not sufficient to discover the connection of the two propositions; what is then to be done? And I say, more propositions must be discovered, by which the two terms of the propositions to be proved are to be connected together. But is this to go on *in infinitum*? If this were the case, there could be no demonstration, or science of any kind; for, if every thing was to be proved, nothing could be proved. There must, therefore, be some propositions, which require no proof: These are called *axioms* or self-evident propositions; in which, by the same faculty that enables us to form ideas, I mean the intellect, we discover the necessary connection betwixt the two terms*.

And here it is evident, that before we can arrive at self-evident propositions, many other propositions must be formed, and all these must be arranged, and put together in such an order as to make demonstration or science. To know how to do this is itself a great science; the greatest, I think, that ever was discovered by man.

2 K

It

* See, upon the subject of Axioms, vol. B p. 389, and following.

It is called Logic; of which Aristotle, and he only, has given us a system; and as all science must begin with an analysis, he has given us a most wonderful analysis of the operations of the human mind; beginning with simple terms; then proceeding to propositions; from thence to the collection of these propositions, which he calls very properly *Syllogism*, and which is the last work of demonstration.

When we consider the infinite variety of subjects, upon which men reason, how this infinity is bounded, and limits set to it by the book upon the Categories, which reduce to classes and numbers the whole things of this universe, and without which there could have been no science of logic, as there can be no science of infinity;—when we consider also the variety of propositions, formed of the ideas contained in the Categories, and the several specieses of them produced by the differences of the predicate and subject, the matter and manner of the proposition, all enumerated by Aristotle and his Commentators to the number of 3024; a number that must appear incredible to those who have never thought upon the subject;—and when we join to all this, the analysis of the syllogisms composed of these propositions into three figures and 14 modes, we must acknowledge, that Aristotle's Logic is the most wonderful system of science that ever was invented; such as could not have been invented by one man, even a man of such a genius as Aristotle, but must have been the invention of a succession of men from father to son for many generations, constantly employed in the cultivation of arts and sciences. Such a succession never was in any other country than Egypt; and which, therefore, I hold to be the parent country of all arts and sciences*.

But even Syllogism is not sufficient for demonstrative reasoning; for there must be likewise *Definition*, by which we know exactly the nature

* See page 54, and following of the preface to the III. vol. likewise p. 45. of the same preface, where I have enlarged much upon the wonderful invention of logic, and the utility of it.

nature of the subjects that we join together in propositions: For unless we know with the greatest accuracy the meaning of the words that we employ to express our ideas, it is impossible that we can demonstrate. And here we return again to the doctrine of ideas, and the division of them into genus and species, substance and accident; one of which two divisions must be expressed in the definition, according to the nature of the subject.

And here it is to be observed, that a single predicate or subject of a proposition may be expressed by several words. Of this the first Axiom of Euclid, and which one may think should be a very simple proposition, *That things, which are equal to the same thing, are equal to one another*, may furnish us an example. For there *the equality of things to one another*, is predicated of *things equal to the same thing*: Where both the predicate and the subject are ideas compounded of several ideas, and expressed by several words*.

Thus it appears, that definitions, as well as axioms, are necessary for science; and, therefore, Euclid has prefixed to his System of Geometry, both definitions and axioms.

And here I would advise a man, who desires to learn the art of reasoning, to study the Elements of Euclid, before he applies to the Logic of Aristotle: For in Euclid he will readily perceive the progress of the mind from propositions self-evident to propositions that need to be demonstrated; and this upon subjects the most simple of any that are the subject of science and the least removed from the perceptions of sense, being lines and figures, which are represented to the sight, not like other subjects of science to be comprehended only by intellect. The method Euclid follows in his demonstrations is called the *Synthetic Method*, by which he proceeds from self-evident propositions, or propositions before demonstrated,

to

* Vol. I. p. 391. and following.

to the theorem, or problem, which is proposed to be demonstrated. But I would advise the student of geometry, not only to follow that method, but to reverse it, and practice what is called *the analytic* method, which begins where the other method ends, that is with the proposition to be demonstrated; and inquires whether that proposition be not necessarily connected with some self-evident proposition, or some proposition, one or more, that had been before demonstrated: So that, as it begins where the other method ends, it ends where the other method begins. And I am persuaded, that, in this analytical way, the truth of the propositions, which Euclid has demonstrated, was first discovered: For analysis is the beginning of all science: And by going thus forward and backward in the demonstration, the young student more perfectly comprehends the truth of it.

It was the application of reasoning to subjects so simple as to be presented to the eyes, which I am persuaded determined the Pythagoreans to make geometry the first study of their scholars; for they thought it was teaching them in the easiest way, to know what demonstration was. And, further, they thought that it was the easiest and most natural way of raising the mind from objects of sense to things immaterial, which have a real and permanent existence; and, therefore, were called by these philosophers the *τα οὐρανία*, whereas things material, are always changing, and in a constant vicissitude of generation and corruption, so that a material thing was said by them to be always *becoming* something, but never to be *actually* any thing: By which circumlocution we only can render in English what they expressed in two words, *οὐκ ἔστι ἀλλὰ γίγνεται*. It was for this reason that geometry, and arithmetic were called *Μαθηματικά*, as teaching men to reason, and to raise their minds above the perceptions of sense, which was the chief object of that exalted philosophy. But a man, in those days, would have been thought ridiculous, who, because he understood lines and figures, thought

thought himself a philosopher, even though he had joined to the knowledge of geometry, the science of numbers, which was also very carefully taught in the Pythagorean school. It was only by the study of morals, natural philosophy, metaphysics, and theology, that a man in that school could deserve the name of a philosopher. These studies, however, of geometry and arithmetic, were held to be very proper preparatives for philosophy; and, I think I may add, for logic, though even logic by those philosophers was not held to be, properly speaking, philosophy, but only an *organ* of philosophy.

As to the utility of logic, I need only repeat what I have said in more than one place of this work, That no man can ever know what science is without studying the logic of Aristotle, and must reason as a child reasons, or as an unlearned man speaks, without knowing the principles of the art, or being able to tell why one argument is conclusive and another not*. It is, therefore, surprising, that any man should pretend to be learned in any science, who does not so much as know what science is.

But, in the progress from sensations to science, there is a step which is necessary, and has been made by all men before they attained to science, and that is *opinion*, which is not like the conclusions of science necessarily true, but may be either true or false, as it happens. All men, when they first begin to think, must form *opinions*, particularly concerning what is good or ill in human life. And by far the greater part of mankind, as they never attain to science, have only opinions by which they are governed. And, therefore, when Polybius has said, that man is *Ζῷον δοξοποιῆτινον*, that is an *opinion-forming animal*, he has given a very good definition

* See the passage above quoted from the preface to third volume of this work. See also vol. I. book V. chap. IV. where the nature of the syllogism and its usefulness are explained at great length. See also vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 47. and following.

tion of a great plurality of the human species, but not so good a definition as Aristotle has given, which takes in the whole species, and marks the progress of Man, from the mere sensitive animal to the perfection of his nature by intellect and science, of which progress Polybius in his definition has only mentioned one step.

But as opinions are so prevalent among men, and govern the lives of so great a majority of them, it was fit that Aristotle should teach us, in this great logical work of his, not only how to argue, from self-evident propositions, and so demonstrate, but also how to argue from the common opinions of men, and in that way persuade men, who do not so much as know what demonstration is.

And, here we may admire the admirable order and economy of this great work. First he begins with simple terms, arranged and divided into ten classes: And this is the subject of his first book upon logic, entitled *Categories*. In the second book, entitled *πρὸς ἑρμηνείας*, or *Of Interpretation*, he proceeds to treat of propositions, which he has divided in the wonderful manner above mentioned. His third logical work is entitled the *First Analytics*, in which he treats of the form of the syllogism, and shows us how the propositions are to be arranged and connected together, so that the conclusion must necessarily follow from the premisses. But that is not demonstration, because the premisses may be false; and then the conclusion will be false also. But, in his *Second Analytics*, he proceeds to show, how not only the form of the syllogism may be regular, but the conclusion of it made true and certain. And, in this way, he accomplishes what he professes to be the design of the whole work*; namely, to show us what science and demonstration is. And he concludes this *magnum opus*, the greatest work of science that ever was executed, with the work above mentioned, upon *Popular Argumentation*, or reasoning

* In the beginning of his *First Analytics*.

reasoning from opinions, which he entitles *Dialectic* *, to which he subjoins a treatise, *De Sophisticis Elenchis*, where he shows how the captious arguments of the sophists of those times were to be refuted.

And thus he concludes his *Logical Work*, consisting of six treatises, in which he has shown us not only what *Science* is, but what *Art* is; for nothing deserves the name of art, which is not founded upon principles of science: So that, in this work, we have explained to us the principles of all arts and sciences.

And, now I think I have fully explained Aristotle's definition of Man, by showing not only what it is that he makes the genus of this definition, namely, a *Logical Animal*, but also by showing the progress from that logical or comparative faculty, which Man has in common with the better kind of brutes, to the operation of intellect in forming ideas, and then his progress from ideas to science, where his progress in this life ends. If all this can be better done or done at all, upon other principles than those which the antient philosophy furnishes, I shall acknowledge that Mr Harris and I have bestowed our time to very little purpose upon the study of that philosophy. But if, on the other hand, that cannot be done, the greatest admirers of the modern philosophy must confess, that, without the assistance of the Ancients, we cannot so much as tell what sort of animal we ourselves are: And if we do not know what *man* is, it is impossible, as I have elsewhere observed, that we can know any thing of God or superior intelligences †.

VOL. IV.

L

CHAP.

* See Vol. VI. of the *Origin of Language*, Book I. Chap. III. in which I have treated very fully of the *Dialectic* of Aristotle, and shown that he has the honour of the invention of that art.

† Page 7. and 8. of this volume.

C H A P. VIII.

Of the necessity of arts and of sciences and a regular polity among Men.
 —Without these, men cannot be happy though associated; and in certain circumstances may be most miserable.—This proved by the example of the people of Paraguay in South America.—Of the two Authors, Charlevoix and Muratori, who give us the history of this people.—The last may be thought the more credible historian; but Charlevoix's Narrative well vouched.—The country of Paraguay of prodigious extent.—The inhabitants of it living under no government, not even the family government, except in time of war;—the most savage and brutal people we read of;—no faith or honesty among them, nor sense of the Pulchrum and Honestum;—addicted to the use of strong liquors, which made them still more barbarous;—very dull and stupid when the Jesuits came among them, but capable of being taught;—more diseased than any civilised people.—This accounted for.—Example of other men who have lived in a brutish manner, but not so brutish as the Paraguaise before they were civilised.—Of the hardships and dangers the Jesuits went through in civilising them.—Had the greatest difficulty to get at several of these nations, through desarts and forests.—Had their languages to learn;—and their Sorcerers and Magicians to encounter.—Their greatest obstacle was their apprehension of the Spaniards making Slaves of them when they were Christians.—Of the martyrdom the Jesuits suffered, to the number of 30.—Of the opposition they met with from the Spanish noblemen who governed the commanderies.—Notwithstanding all these obstacles, the Jesuits in the beginning of this century had established 30 Missions.—The greatest order and good government in all those missions.—The Jesuits did not chuse that the number in any of their missions

missions should exceed 6,000, as they thought great numbers could not be well governed;—were very attentive to the education of the youth, teaching them all the useful arts of life.—Nothing the Savages learnt so well as music;—learned the use of arms, and performed great actions both against the Indians and Portuguese;—not deserted by the Jesuits when in the field.—Opposition given to the arming them with fire arms.—Of the division of property among them.—No money allowed among them.—Were made most zealous Christians.—Became Apostles themselves, and suffered martyrdom.—An account of their happy state, given in a letter by the Governor of Paraguay to the King.—The love they bore to their teachers, and their teachers to them.—Of the methods by which the reformation was brought about.—1st, By Religion:—The Indians tamed and civilised by the Jesuits, in the same manner as the Greeks were by Orpheus.—2dly, By Music, in the way that Amphion civilised the Greeks:—The Jesuits may also be compared to Prometheus.—3tio, By Government the Indians were civilised.—Without government Man an imperfect animal.—Observations upon the Men of Paraguay in their wild state.—The state of civilisation and government absolutely necessary to make men live in an orderly way.—The Paraguaise wanting these, and having the use of strong liquors, the wildest people that we have ever heard of.—No sense in them of the Pulchrum and Honestum, which cannot be, but where there is government.—Of the diseases to which they are liable; and the reasons why they are so much diseased. Of the difference betwixt them and the inhabitants of the Pelew-Islands, and the New Zealanders.—Of the methods used by the Jesuits to civilise them; and first Religion.—This natural to man.—All men who have the least use of reason, must be convinced that beings superior to man exist:—These beings they will obey.—It was not by teaching only that the Jesuits made Christians of the Indians, but by a worship of pomp and show.—Of their processions and triumphal Arches.—A particular description of them.—

Music, a great part of the Religion, to which the Indians were converted.—Of the natural power of Music over man; without it the Savages of Paraguay could not have been converted.—The last method the Jesuits used, was the establishment of a good Government among them.—This was a Religious Government.—The best Government in Antient times, such as the Heroic Government in Greece, was connected with Religion.—The story of the civilisation of these Savages, a renewal of the History of Antient times.—To be considered, whether Religion be not as necessary for continuing good Government among men, as for introducing it.—Of the dispersion of the Jesuits;—a great blow to learning;—compared to the dispersion of the Pythagorean Colleges in Magna Graecia.—Of the noviciate of 15 years, the Jesuits went through before they were admitted into the order;—were not only taught themselves, but taught others;—after they were admitted, they were disposed of by the superior of the order according to their different geniuses.—Not known what is become of the Missions in Paraguay after the dissolution of the order of Jesuits.—Their parting with their Disciples most sorrowful.—If they had not chosen to leave them, the power of Spain could not have forced them.—Might have established many more Missions,—and made a new Empire, and a new World of Learning in that Country.

HAVING explained in the preceding chapters the operations of the Human Intellect, first in forming ideas, and then of these ideas, arts, and sciences, the reader would naturally expect that, in this History of Man, I should proceed to show in what country or countries these arts and sciences had a beginning, and where first a regular polity was formed, without which no progress could be made in them. But, before I proceed to this most important part of the History of Man, I think it will not be improper to show the necessity of these inventions, and that without them men, though associated,

associated, cannot be happy in any circumstances or situation; but, in certain circumstances, may be most miserable, and at the same time the wildest and most savage animal on this earth. This I will show, by the example of a people in South America, known by the name of Paraguaise; from whose history we may also learn this most important lesson, how men are to be recovered from so desperate a state, and arts and civility introduced among them. It is an event, the most remarkable, I think, in modern history; and we have an account of it from two authors, first *Charlevoix* the Jesuit, who has given a very full and circumstantial account of it in three quarto volumes; and then *Muratori*, who has given us a short, but very distinct account of the civilising, or as it may be called, the humanising of those savages. His history I consider as an excellent abridgment of *Charlevoix*, though it was published several years before *Charlevoix*'s work; and by many he will be thought an author more worthy of credit, as he was no Jesuit, whereas *Charlevoix*, as I have said, was a Jesuit, and on that account may be thought partial to his brethren of that order, who were the principal actors in this great work of making men and christians of the most savage people that I believe ever existed. But, he has supported the truth of his history by copies of original writings, which he has subjoined to his 2d and 3d volumes, under the name of *Pieces Justificatives*; nor do I think that there is any good reason to doubt of any of the facts he relates, unless, perhaps, the miracles, which he says were wrought for the conversion of the savages, and which, whether true or false, it was proper they should believe.

The country of Paraguay, as described by *Charlevoix*, is of prodigious extent; stretching all the way from the lake *Xarcies*, where the river Paraguay rises, (which gives its name to the people), along that river, and as far south as the Straits of Magellan, and bounded by Brazil

Brazil upon the east, and upon the west by Peru and Chili *. It is inhabited by a great number of small nations: For, into such, men at first associated; and it was only in process of time that great nations were formed. All these nations were in a state of the greatest barbarity when the Jesuits came among them, excepting only the *Manasicas*, who, from the account which Charlevoix gives of them†, appear to have had some civility and government among them: But all the rest of them had no kind of government at all, not even family government. They lived in the Cyclopiian way, in detached families, but of which the father had no authority over his children, who had such abhorrence of all constraint or obedience to superiors, that they had no regard to the commands of either father or mother. These families, however, when they went to war with any of their neighbours, associated together, under a chief who was called a *Cacique*, but who had no authority except while the war lasted‡. None of them practised any kind of agriculture; and all of them lived chiefly by hunting and the flesh diet, of which they were so ravenous, that they ate of it as often as they could find it, as tygers and lions do: So that, as Muratori tells us, it was with the greatest difficulty, that their instructors, the Jesuits, could persuade them to make regular meals such as Europeans make. They were Canibals too, and the worst of that kind we have ever heard of. The New Zealanders eat only their enemies, as the Indians of North America formerly did, and as some of them, far removed from any commerce with the Europeans, do at this day; but the Savages of Paraguay ate their countrymen and friends, when they could surprize and catch them. In short, men were their prey as much as the beasts of the field are ours§; and human flesh being, as I have observed,

* Charlevoix's History of Paraguay, vol. I. p. 7.

† Ibid. vol. II. p. 274.

‡ Ibid. vol. I. p. 191, and 192.

§ Muratori, p. 26.

served*, very delicious, they appear to have preferred it to all other; and Charlevoix mentions a Cacique who made it his ordinary diet †. And not only did they eat men when they could get them, but they ate other animals of prey, such as tygers ‡, which no other animal of prey does. Monkeys too they ate; and such was their passion for animal food, that they ate worms, moles, vipers, and reptiles of every kind §. There was no faith nor honesty in them, nor had they any sense of the *Pulchrum* and *Honestum* in actions or sentiments, which, as Polybius has very well observed, only comes after men are civilised, and live under a regular government.

Their barbarous dispositions were inflamed and made much more brutal by the use of a fermented liquor, which they made of rice, and called *chica*. For they were so unhappy, that though they had not learned the common arts of life, they had invented, or what I rather believe to be the truth, had learned from the Spaniards the art of making this intoxicating liquor; of which they drank to such excess, that, in their drunkenness, they did things which Charlevoix does not chuse to mention.

As to their genius and natural parts, Charlevoix tell us, that when the Jesuits came among them they were quite dull, and unable to comprehend any thing that they could not perceive by their senses; so that the Jesuits were in doubt, whether they ought to admit them to the participation of any sacrament, except that of baptism, and consulted their superiors the Bishops upon the subject: But they were soon convinced that they had the capacity, when properly taught, of learning any thing ||.

* Page 62. of this volume.

† Charlevoix, vol. I. p. 365.

‡ Ibid. p. 387.

§ Ibid.

|| Ibid. p. 240. and 242.

I will mention only one thing more concerning these nations: It is what may appear very surprising at first sight to those of my readers who have been informed, and truly informed, that barbarous nations are much more healthy than the civilised, whereas the nations of Paraguay are more diseased than any civilised people we read of. For, according to the account Charlevoix gives of them, they are liable to more pestilential and epidemic diseases than any other people upon the face of the earth, and not only grown people among them die of those diseases, but there is a great mortality among their children; so great, that their forcerers and magicians imputed it to the baptism which the Jesuits administered to them. But when we consider what I have said of their manner of living, devouring so much flesh, and drinking so much of intoxicating liquor, it is rather surprising that they are not more depopulated or altogether extinguished.

Upon the whole, though we read of many nations, who in antient times lived in a brutish manner, copulating promiscuously, even such nations as in later times became most learned and polite, such as the Athenians, among whom Cecrops first instituted marriage, from whence he had the name of *dispos*, yet there is no example in antient or modern history of men so extremely barbarous, so wicked, and so much worse than any brutes, as the inhabitants of Paraguay were, before they were tamed and humanised by the Jesuits.

These fathers began their operations among them about the beginning of last century; and suffered hardships, and encountered dangers, in the prosecution of their design to civilise and make christians of them, such as could not be credited, if they were not very well

well attested. In the first place, they had the greatest difficulty to get access to some of these nations, which never had been conquered by the Spainards, and were hardly known to them. For this purpose, they were obliged to travel through pathless deserts for hundreds of miles, and to cut their way with axes through forests otherwise unpenetrable even by foot passengers. And, when they came among them, they had their language to learn, which was very different in the different nations. Then they had their Sorcerers and Magicians to encounter, who would very naturally oppose such an innovation in the religion of the country, as the Jesuits proposed to make. But their greatest obstacle of all was the hatred of those nations to the Spainards, who had made slaves of so many of them, after converting them to christianity, and who they supposed intended to make slaves of them all when they were converted. It was this chiefly which raised the spirit of the people against them, who, headed by their Caciques, persecuted the Jesuits wherever they could find them, and bestowed upon many of them, to the number of above 30, as Muratori says, (more than a third I believe of all those who were employed in those missions), the crown of martyrdom, which they appeared to desire rather than to shun; and one of them, mentioned by Charlevoix, of the name of Lizardi, was in a transport of joy upon the hopes he had of ending his life in that way, and which accordingly happened*.

A greater obstacle I believe to the success of the Jesuits than any I have mentioned, was the opposition of the Spanish Noblemen, who governed in South America certain districts called *Commanderies*, in which they made those Indians, converted to christianity, serve them as slaves: Whereas the Jesuits made all those of their missions, or *Reductions* as they called them, free men as well as christians, knowing so much of the disposition of the Indians, that if they were

VOL. IV.

M

to

* Charlevoix, vol. III. p. 168.

to purchase christianity at the expence of their liberty, they never could make any considerable number of converts. These Noblemen not only made all the interest they could against them at the Court of Madrid, but stirred up against them the Spanish Bishops in South America; by one of whom, and the mob he raised against them, they were driven out of the town of Ascension, the capital of Paraguay.

But notwithstanding the persecutions of Infidels, and the loss thereby of so many of their number, and notwithstanding the opposition of avaricious and interested christians, the Jesuits were so successful, that they had established in Paraguay, and the neighbouring countries, in the beginning of this century, 30 Reductions, containing each between 4000 and 6000 people. But neither Muratori, who published his work in 1743, nor Charlevoix who published in 1756, tell us how many there were when they wrote. But there is one, Florentine, a Capuchine quoted by Muratori*, who says that, in 1712, when he wrote, there were above 100 towns built, all inhabited by christians; by which I do not understand that they were all missions of the Jesuits, but towns inhabited, partly by Spainards, and partly by converted Indians.

The order and good government established by the Jesuits, in those missions, was wonderful as it is described by Charlevoix. The fathers had the direction and superintendency of the whole: But they had officers under them, who took care that all their orders were punctually executed; so that I do not believe there ever was a private family more regularly governed than these little states. For they did not chuse that their missions should consist of great numbers, or of any number exceeding 6000: And in that they imitated

ed the wisdom of the antient philosophers, particularly Aristotle, who did not think it was possible to govern well any very great community; and, therefore, he limited the number of the citizens in his commonwealth to the number, as I remember, of 10,000.

They bestowed the greatest pains on the education of their Neophytes, as they called the new converted christians, instructing them, with the greatest care, in all the useful arts of life; and particularly agriculture, which they learned from the Jesuits themselves, who taught them the use of the plough and spade, to sow and to reap, working themselves with them*. They had shops and work houses where they were taught the mechanic arts, such as the arts of carpenters, smiths and even painters, of sculptors and guilders and likewise of clock-makers: And the children were applied to those different trades, according as their genius and inclination seemed to direct; for, as Charlevoix has observed, art ought to be directed by nature†. They had schools also where they were taught reading and writing, and also arithmetic, which went no farther among them, while in their savage state, than to count as far as *twenty*, the number of their fingers and toes. They taught them also, the art of building, so that they not only built churches for themselves, but ornamented them in very good taste with paintings and engravings‡. The women also were taught all the arts proper for their sex, such as spinning and weaving§.

In all these arts, according to the accounts of which Charlevoix and Muratori have given us, they made great proficiency; but in none, I think so much, as in music; for which they showed such

M 2

* Charlevoix, vol. I. p. 242.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid. p. 243.

a wonderful génius, that, as Charlevoix says, one should think, they sung like birds, by instinct * ; which confirms an observation I have made in more than one place, that music is much more natural to man than articulation, which is very difficult to be learned, and can hardly be learned at all, except when we are very young.

Nor were the fathers content to teach those Savages the arts of civil life ; but they made soldiers of them, and the best militia in that part of the world : For they were not only a match for the Indians, and particularly a barbarous nation among them they called *Mamelus*, who infested the Spanish dominions very much, but even for the regular disciplined troops of the Portuguese, whom they defeated more than once. And when they made prisoners of them, they treated them with great humanity ; particularly upon one occasion, when the provisions failed them in a long march, they divided what they had with their Portuguese prisoners, gave them mules to carry them to the nearest of their Reductions, and guides to show them the way †. The several Reductions furnished, upon one occasion, 6000 men, when the Spainards could only furnish 800 ‡ : And, upon another occasion, 4000 of them, with only 300 Spainards, took by assault a very strong place belonging to the Portuguese, and very obstinately defended by them §. And all this service they performed to the King of Spain, at their own expence, receiving no pay, and furnishing their own arms and provisions ||. And, upon one occasion, they refused the reward that was offered them by the Spanish general for their good services ¶.

Nor

* Charlevoix, vol. I. p. 257.

† vol. II. p. 187.

‡ vol. III. p. 73.

§ vol. II. p. 194.—199.

|| Ibid. p. 199.

¶ Ibid. p. 261.

Nor did their faithful pastors desert them when they took the field, but attended them even in their battles; and when any of them fell, they went to them exposing themselves to the greatest danger from the fire of the enemy, in order to give them all the comfort they could while they were dying *.

But even in forming this militia, without which, I am persuaded, the Spainards in that part of the world must have been conquered by the Portuguese or Indians, they met with great opposition from their enemies both in the Court of Madrid and in India, and it was with great difficulty that they obtained the permission of giving the use of fire arms to their Neophytes, without which they could have been of little service.

As to property in their little states, there was not an entire community of goods in them, nor was it all private property; but the Jesuits followed a middle way which I think better than either. Every man had a portion of ground allotted him, which he cultivated for himself: But there was a great track of ground set apart for the public, which was cultivated by the whole community, and the fruits given to every man who needed it; so that they enjoyed the great blessing, that Agur prayed for, *of neither poverty nor riches.*

As to riches, these Jesuit legislators adopted a most valuable part of the policy of Lycurgus, who forebade the use of money among his citizens. Commerce, therefore, in the missions, was carried on in the most antient and I believe best way, by exchange.

While the Neophytes were thus employed in the arts both of peace and war, religion was not neglected among them; but, on the contrary,

* Vol. II. p. 286.

trary, they were most assiduous and punctual in the discharge of all their duties as christians; nor do I believe that in the present age there are or have been, in any country, more zealous and fervent disciples of Christ. They became at last apostles themselves, and laboured much in the conversion of their barbarous neighbours; some of them, Charlevoix tells us, in that service suffered even martyrdom*.

In short the people, who were collected by the Jesuits in those missions, were entirely changed, and, from the wildest of all barbarians of whom we read, were become tame, gentle, orderly and regular in their life and conduct, and practising every virtue belonging to human nature. This is attested in a letter written by the governor of Paraguay to the King of Spain, of which Charlevoix has given us the contents†, wherein he says, 'That he had visited all the reductions in his province; and that he found them all in a state, which could not be believed by any who had not seen it with his own eyes: That nothing could be added to the policy and good order in which they lived, to the innocence of their manners, and the piety and union among them: That the tender affection and respect, which they showed for their pastors, could not be expressed; and that every one of them was disposed to sacrifice with pleasure his life, and all that he possessed in the world, for the service of God and his Majesty'. To this account of them I will only add, that as the greatest pleasure we enjoy in this life, is to love and to be loved, the Indians of those missions enjoyed that pleasure in a very high degree, loving, as they did, their governors, and being so much beloved by them, a thing which very rarely happens. And when to that we join their religion, the excellent government they lived under, the vices of which they were cured, particularly their chief

* Vol. II. p. 264.

† Vol. II. p. 261.

chief vice, drunkenness*, and the arts of life which they had learned from their governors, I think we may pronounce with great assurance that they were as happy as any people that ever existed, while they continued under the government of the Jesuits.

We are now to inquire how so wonderful a change was wrought upon those barbarians: And this is an inquiry which belongs, as much or more than any other, to the history of man; for it is inquiring how man, from a state more wild and savage than that of any brute, came to be a mild and gentle animal, and in a state which fitted him for the acquisition of arts and sciences, by which only our nature, in this state of our existence, can be brought to any degree of perfection. And I say that it was first by religion, the great tamer and civiliser of men, without which I hold that no nation ever was or ever can be civilised. The Jesuits there, were, among those Indians, what Orpheus was among the Greeks, of whom Horace says,

Sylvestres homines facer interpretsque Deorum
Cædibus et victu fædo deterruit Orpheus†.

where by the words *cædibus et victu fædo*, it is evident Horace meant that the Greeks then killed and ate their fellow creatures, as the Indians of South America did before they were tamed and humanised by their Missionaries, and as the Indians of North America, I believe, at once did, and some, far to the west and beyond the Apulachian mountains, do at this day‡. And, 2dly, By music, for which men have a natural and instinctive love, and organs which easily adapt themselves to the performance of it. And particularly this was the case

* Vol. I. p. 256.

† De Arte Poetica, v. 391.

‡ Origin and Progress of Language, vol. I. p. 227. in the note.

case of the Indians of the missions. Charlevoix tells us, that when the Jesuits were sailing upon the rivers, and for their own entertainment singing sacred hymns, numbers of Indians flocked to hear them; and the Jesuits, by explaining to them the subject of those hymns, made converts of many of them †. Nor do I believe that any thing contributed more to the advancement of religion in their missions, than the choirs which, Charlevoix says, they had in all their churches ‡. And here the Missionaries may be said to have acted among the Indians the part which Amphion acted among the Greeks, as Horace tells us,

Dictus et Amphion, Thebanæ conditor arcis,
Saxa movere sono testudinis, et prece blanda
Ducere quo vellet—

where the uncivilised Greeks, at that time as dull and stupid as the Jesuits found the Indians when they came among them §, are not unfitly imaged by Stones. Those Missionaries may likewise, in the allegorical and poetical stile, properly enough be said to be *Prometheuses*, who made men; for the Indians, before they were civilised by them, were wild beasts, and the worst of wild beasts, who did not deserve the name of men.

The last method, I shall mention, used to tame those Savages, was to establish a polity and regular form of government among them. For, as man is intended, by God and nature, to live in civil society, which cannot be without government, it is evident that, if he be not governed, he is an imperfect animal who cannot answer the purpose for which he is in this world. The Indians therefore of the missions were formed into regular governments, had property

† Vol. I. p. 241.—242.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid. p. 240.

property assigned to them, without which no state or community can subsist, and were taught arts by which that property was to be made useful.

From what I have said of the Indians in their wild state, and the methods that were used to civilise them, the following observations naturally arise.

In the *first* place, it may be observed, that though men may be associated and live together, yet, if there be not government among them, not even the family government, so that *every man does what seemeth good in his own eyes*, (the description which our scripture gives us of the worst state that I think men can be in), it is impossible, by the nature of things, but that in such a society there must be the greatest disorder. And when to that disorder is added the intemperate use of strong liquors, by which the disorderly passions of such men must be very much inflamed:—And when to all this is added the flesh diet, carried to such excess as to make men devour every thing of the animal life that comes within their reach, even their own species, the most unnatural of all food, and such as no land animal except man uses, the disorders in such a society must go to such an excess, as to make man a wild beast, and worse than any other wild beast which does not feed upon his own species. In such a society there can be no sense of the *Pulchrum* and *Honestum*, which is the foundation of all virtue among men, and of every generous and noble sentiment. Of this, it is observed by Diodorus Siculus and other writers, that nations living in the brutal state, though not in a state so brutal as that of the wild Indians, are entirely void. And Polybius has very well observed, that this sense comes to men only when government is established among them: For, though it be as natural to man as intellect and science, yet he has, in the first stages of his progression, only the capacity of acquiring it as

well as intellect and science; so that, like these, it lyes latent in him till it be produced by certain circumstances and situations of life. It is from their most intemperate and unnatural flesh diet, without any mixture of vegetables, as we use it, and joined with their drunkenness, that these barbarous Indians are more diseased than any other barbarians we hear of: For even the common flesh diet, though used with moderation and without strong liquors, not being natural to man, produces diseases, and shortens life, as is evident from the long lives of the Antedeluvian Patriarchs, who ate no flesh, and I think is evident from our own experience of men, who, having lost their health by intemperance, the flesh diet and the use of strong liquors, have recovered it by the vegetable diet and drinking water. Now, what will recover health when lost, will much more preserve it before it be lost. With respect to the diseases of these Indians, I will only further observe, that nothing endeared their Missionaries more to them, than their attendance upon them when they were dying, and their administering all the rites of their Church to give them comfort, and ease of mind, in their last moments. — And thus I think I have accounted for the savage dispositions of the Indians before they were tamed by the Jesuits, and for their want of health.

What I have said here, of the brutality and misery of those Indians, may appear contradictory to the account I have given of the inhabitants of the Pelew Islands and the New Zealanders*: But it should be considered, that the men of the Pelew Islands do not live by hunting, as those Indians do, but upon the fruits of the earth, and what fish they can catch, eating no flesh, except that of some birds which they may happen to kill, and having no use of strong liquors; and they have a very regular and orderly government, as I have shown†. And, as to the New Zealanders, they have no four footed beasts in their Island; therefore they are not hunters, and so do not live upon flesh, but upon vegetables, particularly the

roots

* Page 36.

† Ibid.

roots of the fern and what fish they can catch ; and have no use at all of strong liquors. And it appears that they have a regular government, and practice an art, of which there could be no use except in a regular and a free government, I mean the Rhetorical Art *. How different the character and manners of these two nations must be from those of the wild Indians, is evident at first sight. And the truth appears to be, that, as I have elsewhere observed †, man, while he is yet a mere animal with only the capacity of being a rational creature, is not a social, and much less a political, animal ; for, as Marcus Antoninus has very well observed in his *Meditations*, *he is Political because he is Rational* ‡. We are not therefore to wonder that the Indians of Paraguay, living without arts or civility, and feeding only upon flesh, and even the flesh of their own species, and having their passions inflamed by the most intemperate use of strong liquors, should be so savage and wild a people as they are described by the Jesuits.

I will now proceed to make some reflections upon the methods that were used to recover the Paraguarise from so barbarous a state. The first method I mentioned was *Religion*, without which, as I have said, no nation ever was civilised. For, the belief of a power superior to man, I hold to be absolutely necessary, when men have come to think at all, or to have any use of reason ; nor do I believe, that there either is or ever was any assemblage of men, deserving the name of a nation, that did not believe that there are powers that govern in this world, infinitely superior to man. This no man, who thinks and observes what passes around him, can doubt of. Upon such powers he will suppose that his happiness or misery must depend ; and he will naturally believe them to be moved, as he himself is, by supplications and intreaties ; and that they will

N 2

favour

* *Origin of Language*, vol. VI. p. 4.

† Page 62. of this Volume.

‡ *Εστι το λογικον, αυτος και πολιτικον. Meditat. Lib. 10.*

favour those who apply to them in that way, and who do what is agreeable to them, but on the contrary, will punish those who neglect them, and act contrary to their will. Whatever, therefore, is recommended to them, as the command of those superior powers, will be readily obeyed. And, thus it appears, that religion is founded in the nature of man; and that it is impossible to conceive any number of men collected together, having the least use of reason, though they do not employ it otherwise than in procuring the necessities of life, without supposing that they have some idea of superior powers, by whom they are to be assisted or hindered in procuring those necessities of life. And, accordingly, in all the barbarous nations of which we have heard, there were men who pretended to have a communication with those superior powers, and to predict to their countrymen events which were to happen, and upon which their good and ill fortune depended. Such there were even among those barbarous Indians, and who, therefore, were their instructors and directors in all their affairs. Among these men the Jesuits introduced Christianity. But it was not by teaching only, or reasoning with them, that they made them Christians. But they applied to their senses, by which Savages are much more governed than by reason; and captivated them by a worship of pomp and show, festivals and processions*, with many ceremonies, which may appear to many to be mere superstition, but with which the Catholic Religion, as is well known, abounds.

One

* The procession of the Holy Sacrament passes under a triumphal arch, composed of branches of trees adorned with flowers, and with birds of different kinds and colours attached to the branches by very long strings, so that they seem to be altogether at their liberty; and by their notes, mixed with the music of the procession, make a most agreeable melody. This, says Charlevoix, (vol. I. p. 258. and 269.) is a beauty of simple nature; and, for my part, the sight of such an arch so adorned, would have pleased me more than any arch which architecture could erect; and the music of such a procession I likewise believe would have pleased me more than any concert I ever heard.

One of the greatest allurements of these Savages, and which made multitudes of them follow the Missionaries, was, as I have observed, music, and music such as the Church music among the Roman Catholics is, tending to inspire devout and religious sentiments. How great the power of music is, and how congenial to the nature of man, is well known to the philosopher, and indeed is a matter of common observation and experience. By music, the manners may be formed of young men, even of children, who are incapable of being instructed by teaching or reasoning; and, accordingly, it was very much employed by antient wisdom in the education of youth. And if it had not been employed in taming these Savage Indians, and subduing their violent passions, inflamed, as I have said, by their most unnatural diet and manner of life, I do not believe that they ever could have made Christians or even Men of them.

The last method used by the Missionaries for humanising those brutal Savages, was to establish a good government among them. If it had been a popular government, it would have done them no good; but, on the contrary, would have been productive of much disorder. But it was a religious government; for the Missionaries were their governors: And it was administered by officers of their nomination; and it may be observed, that the first governments in all countries were more or less connected with the religion of the country. The government of Egypt, the most antient, and, I think, the best government we read of, was a government by Priests; and the Jewish government was much of the same kind. The first government of the Greeks was by their Heroic Kings, that is, Kings who were supposed to be descended of their Gods.

And here I conclude what I have to say of this remarkable event in Paraguay, which may be said to be a renewal of antient times, and to have verified, by recent facts, the truth of what we are told,
under

under the disguise of fable, of Orpheus and Amphion having civilised the Greeks by religion and music; but which, I believe, to be as much a truth as the Jesuits having civilised, in that way, the people of Paraguay: And I would have our philosophers consider, whether religion be not as necessary for continuing good government among men, as for introducing it at first; or, whether our Scotch philosopher, Mr David Hume, be in the right, who has informed us, that the less religion there is in a nation so much the better.

The order of the Jesuits, who wrought those wonders in Paraguay, is now no more. I was in France when the persecution of them began there; and I had an opportunity of being pretty well informed how it was brought about: But to speak of this is foreign to our present purpose: I will only say, what is very well known, and is acknowledged even by their enemies, that they were the most learned body of men in Europe; nor do I think, that there has been, at any time in Europe, since the Colleges of Philosophers which were instituted by Pythagoras in *Magna Graecia*, a more select body of men: And I hold the dispersion of the Jesuits to be one of the greatest blows that learning and philosophy have got, since the dispersion of those Colleges. The Jesuits, before they could be admitted into the order, went through a novitiate of no less than fifteen years, which time they spent not only in studying most diligently Antient Learning, Antient Philosophy, and Christian Theology, but also in teaching them: For teaching, as well as learning, was part of their education; and, indeed, there is nothing that perfects our knowledge more, in any thing we have learned, than teaching it to others; and it will even make us learned in some degree, when we were ignorant before, according to the common proverbial saying,

Qui docet indoctos, licet indoctissimus esset,
Ipse brevi reliquis doctior esse queat.

And

And after they were admitted into the order, as all men are not by nature fit for all things, for,

Non omnia possumus omnes,

the superior of the order took care to be well informed of the natural bent of the genius of those who entered into the order, and employed them according to their different talents. Some, whose genius seemed to be only for letters, were made Professors in Universities, and employed in writing books of learning. Others, who were of a more active spirit, and more fitted for the business of life, were sent to Courts, and employed as the Confessors of Kings; and very often by their councils the kingdom was governed: While others of a more daring spirit, and who showed an enthusiastic zeal for the propagation of the Gospel among barbarous nations, and had fortitude enough to submit, with resignation, even to martyrdom in that cause, were sent to North or South America, to the East Indies, or to China; and, I believe, they have done and suffered more for the propagation of the Gospel, than all the men of modern times put together: So that they may say,

Quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris.

What is become of their Missions, since they left them, I am very curious to know, but have not been able to learn. I have only been told, what I can very well believe, that the parting was most sorrowful, of them and their dear Neophytes; and that many tears were shed upon both sides. If they had not chosen to leave them, I am confident that the Spainards had no power in South America, that could have forced them: And they might have gone on increasing the number of their little states, and have formed a confederacy among them, not unworthy to be compared to the Achaean league in Greece, which might have been a match for any force that the Spainards could have brought from Old Spain: And I doubt not but that, in process of time, they might have made Jesuits of their disciples; and so established a new world of learning, on the other side of the Atlantic.

B O O K II.

Of the Invention of Arts and Sciences.

C H A P. I.

The subject of this book is the invention of Arts and Sciences, beginning with the Art of Language.—Language not natural to Man, but an Art.—Men herded, and carried on some common business before they Spoke.—Language began with animal cries, varied perhaps by some articulation, in imitation of certain Birds;—varied also by Musical Tones.—By such a Language no progress could have been made in Arts and Sciences.—The Chinese Language not fit for Arts or Sciences:—These, therefore, among them all, put into hieroglyphical writing even their law business.—A Language of Art necessary for the invention of Arts and Sciences.—This the most difficult of all Arts.—Proof of this:—First as to articulation.—This performed by the organs of the mouth operating variously.—The first organ of speech that appears to have been chiefly used, is the throat.—By this guttural sounds are produced, such as the Orang Outang uses, the Wild Girl that was seen in France, and the Huron in North America.—Articulate sounds divided into vowels and consonants.—The nature of these explained.—The vowels few in number, the consonants many.—The consonants much more

more difficult in pronunciation than the vowels.—Differences from thence accounted for, betwixt the barbarous and civilized Languages.—Another difference betwixt the barbarous and civilized Languages, is the extraordinary length of the words of the barbarous Languages :—This accounted for.—Of the origin of articulation.—It could not have been brought to any perfection, but in a country where it was studied and practised as an Art.—Of the progress of articulation from monosyllabical words to words of several syllables.—Of the variety in the sound of Language by diphthongs ;—and by vowels and consonants, aspirated and not aspirated.—Language must have been analysed into its elemental sounds, before the sound of it could be made so perfect.—Of the melody and rhythm of Language.—Of the expression of ideas by Language.—These of number infinite ;—but divided into certain classes or parts of speech.—This division correspondent to the division of our ideas into Categories.—The number of words appear to be infinite ;—made comprehensible in our memories, by the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Composition, and Flexion.—Of Syntax, and the necessity of it.—Conclusion, that Language is the greatest of all Arts.—Objection answered, That children learn to speak without Art.—Speech, though a most common thing, is very wonderful :—An account given how it is learned ;—of so difficult invention, that it would have been a miracle, if Peter the Wild Boy had spoken when he was first caught, or if the Orang Outang could speak.—Objection answered, to the Orang Outang's being a Man, That he is the only Man, that has been found, who could not speak.—General observations upon the invention of Language.

IN this book I propose to treat of the invention of Arts and Sciences, a principal part of the History of Man, the subject of this part of my work. I will begin with the invention of Language, the parent art, as I have said, of all arts and sciences*, and with—
VOL. IV.

* Page 70. of this volume.

out which we must have still continued an animal, only capable of intellect and science.

That language is not natural to man, but an invention of art, I think I have proved sufficiently in what I have written upon the Origin of Language *: Or if the reader should have any doubt in the matter, I hope it will be removed by what follows in this chapter, where I am to show that it is not only an art, but the greatest of all arts, and of the most difficult invention.

That men must have herded together, before they could have invented a language, or indeed any other art, is evident; for it is only by communication together, in one way or another, that men have made any discovery in any art or science, a solitary Savage being incapable of inventing any thing of the least value. That animals, even such as are incapable of intellect and science, when they herd together can communicate without language, and can even carry on some joint work, is also evident; for the beavers, who not only have not the use of speech, but are incapable of acquiring it, can nevertheless carry on their business of building and repairing their dams by signs and gestures and inarticulate cries †. And in the same way the Orang Outang carries on his business, building huts, arming himself with a stick, and attacking and defending himself against his enemies ‡. In this kind of social intercourse men continued, I am persuaded, a very long time, before they invented a language; which certainly took its rise from animal cries §, varied perhaps by some articulation which they may have learned by imitation of such birds as the Cuckoo or Cockitoo, which they may have heard; and I am persuaded that they also varied it by musical tones, that is tones differing in gravity and acuteness; for though

Man

* Vol. I.

† Vol. III. of this work, p. 53.

‡ Page 27. and following of this volume.

§ Origin of Language, vol. I. Book III. Chap. IV.

Man has not from Nature the faculty of articulation like these birds that I have mentioned, yet she has given him the power of varying his natural cries by tones of the musical kind. By this I would not be understood to mean that man by nature sings as some birds do; but that he has from nature such tones of voice, of which music may be formed, and of which, according to Lucretius and the Wild Girl I saw in France, he made songs in imitation of the birds. I am, therefore, persuaded, that the first languages were all more or less musical, as the Greek, Latin, and Sanscrit were; and as the Chinese and the languages of North America are at this day*.

But a language with some articulation and even variety of tones, though it might be sufficient to communicate men's appetites and desires to one another, and to carry on some of the necessary arts of life, never could serve the purpose of expressing ideas and forming arts and sciences. Even the Chinese language, though it have a good deal of articulation, and a wonderful variety of tones, by which it is sufficient for carrying on the common business of life, yet is altogether unfit for communicating matters of art and science; and therefore that is done among the Chinese, by their hieroglyphical writing, expressing not the words of their language, but their ideas. The language they speak is in this respect so deficient, that it is not fit for carrying on their law suits; so that they have no pleadings, but all their judicial proceedings are in their hieroglyphical writing†. It was, therefore, of absolute necessity that a

O 2

language

* Origin of Language, vol. V. p. 443. and vol. VI. p. 132.

† This fact I have taken from a book, in two volumes 12mo, entitled, 'Miscellaneous Pieces relating to the Chinese,' vol. I. p. 12. This is a book in which many curious particulars are related concerning both the written and the oral language of the Chinese; and which, I think, well vouched by the authorities the author quotes. According to the account he gives of the language they speak, it is the most defective, and the most incoherent language, that is now to be found in the world, more defective than any of the barbarous languages, which I have mentioned in the first volume of the

Origin

language of much greater art than the Chinese, or than any other barbarous language, should have been invented, before any considerable progress could have been made in the invention of arts and sciences, which could not be without a more perfect communication by speech.

That a language of art is the greatest as well as most useful art practised by men, and likewise of most difficult invention, I have shown in several passages of the Origin and Progress of Language * : In one of which †, I have observed a very great difference betwixt language and the other arts practised by man : That in these other arts, such as, architecture, sculpture, and painting, nature has furnished us the materials ; whereas of language we have ourselves furnished the materials, that is, articulate sounds, which we may be said to have created ; and this alone makes it the most wonderful of the arts of men. But as the difficulty of the invention of this art is a matter, I think, of great curiosity, and not of common observation ;—and as it will tend much to support the argument, which I am to maintain, that Egypt is the parent country of this as well as of the other arts and of sciences, I will here say a good deal more upon the subject.

As
Origin of Language. And it would be intirely unfit even for the ordinary commerce of life, if they did not supply the defect of their articulation, not by tones only, but by signs and gestures, and something like writing on the palms of their hands. (p. 33.) I once thought that the different significations, which they give to the same monosyllable, had some affinity, so as to resemble in some sort our derivative, compounded or inflected words. But this author has convinced me of the contrary by the example he has given of the monosyllable *po*, which has eleven different significations, according as it is differently accented. In one way accented, it denotes *glass* ; in another way, it signifies *to boil* ; in a third way, *to winnow corn or rice* ; in a fourth way, *sage or prudent or liberal* ; in a fifth way, *to prepare* ; and in a sixth way, *an old woman*, &c. (p. 28.) So that the wonder is, not that such a language should need the aid of gestures, but that, in any way, it should be made intelligible. (see what I have further said of this strange language, vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 139. and following.)

* Vol. I. book III. and vol. II. book II.

† Vol. IV. p. 177. and following ; and Vol. VI. p. 135. and following.

As articulation is essential to language, I will begin with considering the nature of it ; and I trust to make it appear, that this alone is so complicated and various an operation, that if there were nothing more in language, it must appear a work of the greatest art, and altogether of art ; for nature has done no more than to furnish us with the organs of this so artificial operation. So that, articulate sounds, the materials of language, are, as I have said, intirely of our own production.—And here we may observe the difference betwixt music and language. Nature has not only given us an organ for music ; but we have naturally in our voice the variation of *grave* and *acute*, which are the materials of which music is formed.

The organs of pronunciation are the throat, the larynx, the tongue, the palate, the teeth, and the lips ; all of them, as I have observed, out of sight, (except the two last mentioned,) and their operations very nice and delicate. As they are for the greater part concealed, their operations are not perceptible by our senses ; but if we saw them, as we see the operations of our hands, we should, I am persuaded, admire them very much. These organs, which I have mentioned, constitute what Mr Gebelin, an author whom I shall frequently quote in the sequel, calls our *vocal instrument*. He has very minutely and accurately described it in the 6th chapter of the third volume of his *Monde Primitif*. According to his description of it, it is a very complicated machine : And if we can set it agoing, and work it by nature merely, without instruction or example, and without practice or observation, as some imagine, I think there is no machine that we may not work in the same manner, nor any thing of art that we may not perform by mere instinct. I will not repeat what M. Gebelin has said at so great length in the chapter above quoted ; it is sufficient for my purpose to observe, that the breath, which comes from our lungs, and, passing through the wind-pipe, goes out at our mouths, is the material of which speech is composed.

composed. It receives various modifications in its passage through that part of the windpipe which is called the larynx; and particularly from the upper part of the larynx, which is called in English *the knot of the throat*, and in French *la glotte*, by which the breath enters the mouth: And it receives still more modifications in the mouth, by the organs the mouth contains, such as the tongue, the palate, and the teeth, and by the lips, through which it goes into the open air. By a certain position of these organs of the mouth, while the breath is passing through it, are formed those articulate sounds, which we call *vowels*: And by the different actions of those organs are formed sounds of much greater variety, which are called *consonants*, but which, as the name imports, cannot be sounded by themselves, but only in conjunction with the vowels. Our vocal instrument, therefore, is so complex, as M. Gebelin has described it, that it is not only a wind instrument such as a flute, but also a stringed instrument, and likewise an instrument that operates by the touch like an organ*. But before the voice is so variously modified by the organs of the mouth, it receives a modification by different contractions and dilatations of that part of the larynx above mentioned, called the knot of the throat, by which are produced musical tones, differing in acuteness and gravity; which tones, I am persuaded, accompanied the pronunciation of all the antient languages. That this was the case of the Greek and Latin, is well known. The Sanscrit also was and is still a musical language in India, as I have elsewhere observed†; and so was also the Hebrew: And as music is more natural to man than articulation, particularly in the southern and eastern countries, so that I am persuaded he sung before he spoke, I think it could not well be otherwise. *Lastly*, there is another modification of the voice before it comes into the mouth; and that is in the throat, by which it forms guttural sounds.

The

* Vol III. of *Monde Primitif*, p. 74.

† Vol. VI. of *Origin of Language*, p. 149.

The subject, upon which all these various operation are performed, is, as I have observed, the breath from the lungs, which passes through the throat into the mouth, and from thence into the open air; and in that passage it receives all those various modifications, which form articulation. The first of these is from the throat, and the least artificial of any of them. It appears, therefore, to have been first used, and more used than any other, when men first began to speak. The Orang Outang, who has not yet learned the art, utters, as I have said*, guttural sounds; and the Wild Girl I saw in France, who had learned to speak, told me, that the language of her countrymen was full of guttural sounds, and that they spoke every thing with open mouth. The Hurons of North America do the same†; and Baron Hontan tells us, that he spent four days to no purpose, in trying to teach a Huron to pronounce the labial consonants, such as B, P, M ‡; and the reason is, that speech was originally formed from animal cries, as I have elsewhere shown§, which are all with open mouth without any use of the lips.

Articulate sounds are divided, as I have said, into vowels and consonants. For the pronunciation of vowels nothing more is required than a certain position of the organs of the mouth, through which the breath passes. They are, therefore, few in number; nor do I know that any language in the world has more than five of them, though, by compounding them, they make, in the languages of art, several more vocal sounds, called diphthongs. The consonants are formed by different actions of the several organs of pronunciation, which may be said *to articulate* in the proper sense of the word, that is, to break and divide the sound of the vowels, which otherwise would be continuous. They are, therefore, much more numerous than the vowels, and of pronunciation very much more difficult; though they cannot

* Page 28.

† Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 478. and following.

‡ Ibid. p. 502.

§ Ibid. Book III. Chap. IV.

cannot be founded without the vowels, that is, without the breath passing through the mouth.

From what I have said of the nature of vowels and consonants, several particulars concerning the barbarous languages may be explained: And, *1mo*, as the vowels are absolutely necessary for the pronunciation of language, and at the same time are so much more easily pronounced than the consonants, it is very natural that the barbarous languages, for the greater part, should have the use of all the five. All of them, however, have not the whole *five*. The Chinese has not the U, but in place of it uses the diphthong EU. And the same is the case of even the English language; which like the Chinese uses the diphthong in place of the simple vowel. But that this is not the sound of the Greek *ypsilon*, is evident from what the Haliarnassian has told us, in his treatise of *composition*, of the pronunciation of that vowel, and which is preserved in the French language. This alone may show us the difficulty even of the pronunciation of language; when a language, which I reckon one of the best that is now spoken in Europe, has not the use of one of no more than *five* of the most simple sounds of language. But that the barbarous languages should be very deficient in the consonants, is easily accounted for from the difficulty of their pronunciation: And accordingly, the Chinese language wants the consonants, B, D, R, X, and Z*: The Huron language, in North America, wants the consonants B, P, M, as I have before observed †, also the consonants F, V, G, N, and even the vowel U, which the Hurons cannot pronounce for the reasons I have given in the passage quoted below ‡. And the Peruvian language wants no less than six consonants, S, B, D, F, G, and

* See the Miscellaneous Pieces, relating to the Chinese above quoted, Vol. I. p. 24.

† Page 111.

‡ Vol. I. of Origin of Language, 2d edition p. 479.—480.

and X*. 2^{do}, This makes the sound of those languages very vocal, consisting of many syllables of only one-vowel. 3^{tio}, When they use consonants, they seldom use more than one of them in the same syllable; so that when two consonants happen to stand together in the same word, they divide them in the pronunciation into different syllables. Thus in the Peruvian language, they pronounce *Roc-ro* not *Ro cro*†. For to use more, would be to join together different actions of several organs of speech, which make a difficult pronunciation, and indeed impossible to savages who are not accustomed to it: Whereas, in languages of more art, four or more consonants are sounded together in the same syllable, as in the Greek words, *σφυγξ* and *φλοξ*, and the English word, *strength*; where the action of the different organs is so complicated, (more complicated than any action of our hands, or any other member of our body,) that, I am persuaded, no savage, unless he was taught when young, could ever learn to pronounce these words. In order to give a variety to their language, which they want by having so few consonants, and by not making so much use of those they have as they might do, they often repeat in the same word the same syllable, consisting only of one vowel, as in the name of a Lady of Ottaheite, *Othea-Othea*: And indeed, in a language so vocal as theirs, they could hardly, without such a repetition, distinguish the several words from one another.

There is another peculiarity of the barbarous languages, I mean the extraordinary length of their words, but which is derived from another source, namely, that language was originally formed out of animal cries‡, which have all a considerable length; so that the language

VOL. IV. P of

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, 2d edition, p. 505.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. Book III. Chap. IV.

of barbarians is nothing but those cries, joined with some articulation*. But even with their articulation and their words of great length, very different in that respect from the Chinese words, they could not express their meaning fully without signs and gestures, such as our dumb men use. So that their language may be said to be little better than the language of dumb men, aided by some articulation. And the same may be said of the language of the Chinese, who, as I have observed, use a great many signs and gestures to help out their very imperfect articulation, more imperfect I believe than that of any of the barbarous nations.

But, it will be asked, how did those nations get their articulation, imperfect as it is? That they may have learned to articulate some few sounds from such birds as the Cuckoo or Cockitoo, if they happen to be in their country, is, as I have said, possible. But even these few sounds they could not learn to articulate perfectly, as they could hear these birds but seldom, and only at certain seasons of the year: For though our children learn to articulate sounds very much more various and more difficult, by mere imitation, it is by hearing them continually for years together, without any interval, except when they are sleeping. There must, therefore, have been some country where the discovery was made, how much the expression of the human voice might be enlarged by articulation, and where it was studied as an art of the greatest use; nor do I think, that articulation, such as is fit for a language of art, of which only I am now speaking, could otherwise have been invented.

In

* Who would know more of the sound of barbarous languages, may consult vol. I. Origin of Language; and the passages from that vol. quoted in vol. II. p. 6. 7. 8. As to the length of their words, there is one mentioned by Mr de la Condamine, used by a people that he fell in with upon his voyage down the river Amazons, of no less than eight syllables, denoting the number three, the word is, Solazzarorincouricic.

In this invention there must have been a progress, as in the invention of other arts; and I think men must have begun with articulating one sound, and of that making one word, before they joined together several articulate sounds to compose but one word. In short, I believe, that the first languages were all monosyllabical, as the Chinese is at this day. But even this first step in the art of language the Chinese did not make, but got it from Egypt, as I have said elsewhere*, and, I hope, shall prove to the readers satisfaction. But it did not remain, I am persuaded, so long there in that infantine state as it has done in China*; but the monosyllables were lengthend into words of several syllables. The monosyllables, however, were not for that laid aside, but mixed with words of several syllables, which made a beautiful variety in the sound of the language; for without variety there can be no beauty in any art. And besides this variety in a perfect language, there is the variety, above-mentioned, of diphthongs, or vowels run together in the pronunciation, and of vowels aspirated and not aspirated, and of consonants likewise aspirated and not aspirated, and such as are in the middle betwixt these two†.

It may be thought, that what I have said here, of the first languages consisting of monosyllabical words, is contradicted by what I have observed of the great length of words in the barbarous languages. But these languages are without art; and even, artless as they are, they could not have been invented by a barbarous people. What, therefore, they have of articulation, the barbarians must have

P 2

got

* See what I have said further of the Chinese Language, vol. VI. Origin of Language, p. 139. and following.

† See what I have said of the different kinds of letters, vol. II. of Origin of Language, book II. chap. II.

of barbarians is nothing but those cries, joined with some articulation*. But even with their articulation and their words of great length, very different in that respect from the Chinese words, they could not express their meaning fully without signs and gestures, such as our dumb men use. So that their language may be said to be little better than the language of dumb men, aided by some articulation. And the same may be said of the language of the Chinese, who, as I have observed, use a great many signs and gestures to help out their very imperfect articulation, more imperfect I believe than that of any of the barbarous nations.

But, it will be asked, how did those nations get their articulation, imperfect as it is? That they may have learned to articulate some few sounds from such birds as the Cuckoo or Cockitoo, if they happen to be in their country, is, as I have said, possible. But even these few sounds they could not learn to articulate perfectly, as they could hear these birds but seldom, and only at certain seasons of the year: For though our children learn to articulate sounds very much more various and more difficult, by mere imitation, it is by hearing them continually for years together, without any interval, except when they are sleeping. There must, therefore, have been some country where the discovery was made, how much the expression of the human voice might be enlarged by articulation, and where it was studied as an art of the greatest use; nor do I think, that articulation, such as is fit for a language of art, of which only I am now speaking, could otherwise have been invented.

In

* Who would know more of the sound of barbarous languages, may consult vol. I. Origin of Language; and the passages from that vol. quoted in vol. II. p. 6. 7. 8. As to the length of their words, there is one mentioned by Mr de la Condamine, used by a people that he fell in with upon his voyage down the river Amazons, of no less than eight syllables, denoting the number three, the word is, Solazzarorincouric.

In this invention there must have been a progress, as in the invention of other arts; and I think men must have begun with articulating one sound, and of that making one word, before they joined together several articulate sounds to compose but one word. In short, I believe, that the first languages were all monosyllabical, as the Chinese is at this day. But even this first step in the art of language the Chinese did not make, but got it from Egypt, as I have said elsewhere*, and, I hope, shall prove to the readers satisfaction. But it did not remain, I am persuaded, so long there in that infantine state as it has done in China*; but the monosyllables were lengthend into words of several syllables. The monosyllables, however, were not for that laid aside, but mixed with words of several syllables, which made a beautiful variety in the sound of the language; for without variety there can be no beauty in any art. And besides this variety in a perfect language, there is the variety, above-mentioned, of diphthongs, or vowels run together in the pronunciation, and of vowels aspirated and not aspirated, and of consonants likewise aspirated and not aspirated, and such as are in the middle betwixt these two†.

It may be thought, that what I have said here, of the first languages consisting of monosyllabical words, is contradicted by what I have observed of the great length of words in the barbarous languages. But these languages are without art; and even, artless as they are, they could not have been invented by a barbarous people. What, therefore, they have of articulation, the barbarians must have

P 2

got

* See what I have said further of the Chinese Language, vol. VI. Origin of Language, p. 139. and following.

† See what I have said of the different kinds of letters, vol. II. of Origin of Language, book II. chap. II.

got from a people who had the use of language, with whom they happened to have some communication. From them they would learn to articulate some words; and by imitation they would be naturally led to invent other articulate sounds: For I do not think, as I have said, that from hearing only such birds as the Cuckoo and Cockitoo, supposing them to be in their country, and continuing long enough in it to enable them to imitate their voices, the most barbarous languages ever could have been formed. Now, those articulate sounds, which they had learned from nations that had an art of language, they would very naturally lengthen, so as to make them resemble the animal cries, which they used before they got articulate sounds, and which have a certain length. But when language was formed into an art, which could not have been among those barbarians, and when it was intirely removed from animal cries, and made to consist only of articulate sounds put together in a certain order, it was natural, and, indeed, I think, necessary, that men should begin with the most simple words, that is, words of one syllable, before they proceeded to compound those monosyllables into words of many syllables. This, as I have said, in the passage above quoted *, actually happened in Egypt, where the first language of art was invented, as I shall afterwards show. And it was very natural that it should be so in the first step in the progress towards a language of art; for, if the first words of such a language had been words of several syllables, the three great arts of language, *derivation*, *composition*, and *flexion*, could not have been practiced without making the words of great length, as great as the words of the barbarous languages. This monosyllabical language came from Egypt to China, where it is the language at this day; and with it came also the written language, or Hieroglyphical characters, which have such a connection with characters of that kind

* Vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 139. &c.

kind to be seen at this day in Egypt, that they must have come from the same country*.

All the beauty and variety of the sound of language, which I have mentioned, could not have been discovered, if language had not been first analysed into its elemental sounds. This I believe was done before these elemental sounds got a form, which made them visible to the eye; that is to say, before alphabetical characters and writing was invented; which compleated the art of language, by making it speak, not only to those who are present but to the absent, and even to future generations†.

But, besides all the variety I have mentioned, there is still something wanting to make a language of perfect art; and that is melody and rhythm, which make the music of language, and, I believe, where they were governed by art, as they were among the Greeks, added more to the pleasure of the ear than all the things I have mentioned‡. Of these I have treated very fully elsewhere§; and I will only add here, that as in animal cries there is a variety of sounds, differing in tones as well as in length, it was very natural that there should be the same variety in language, which succeeded to those cries, and may be said to have been formed out of them by being articulated; and, accordingly, the most antient languages have all, as I have observed, that variety — And thus I have finished what I have to say of the *sound*, or *material part*, as I call it, of language; which I have analysed into Articulation, Melody, and Rhythm.

But

* Vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 438.

† See more of this subject in vol. II. of Origin of Language, book II. chap. II.

‡ See what I have said upon this subject, vol. VI. Origin of Language, book II. chap. IV. and vol. II.

§ Vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 226. and 227.

But the sound of language, however musical it may be, and pleasant to the ear, is only subservient to the purpose for which language was intended; and that is the expression of our ideas, and the communication of them to one another. A language of art, and which is proper for the invention and cultivation of other arts and of sciences, must express all the things in the heavens or the earth, of which we have any notion or conception. We must give names to accidents as well as to substances, also to the several relations of things to one another; and we must express what they *act* and what they *suffer*. These things are of number infinite. But science here sets bounds to infinity, as we have shown it does in the matter of our ideas of genres and specieses. This is done by the division of words into what is called the Parts of Speech, which may be called the Categories of Language;—comprehending, like the categories, the whole of things, but divided and arranged in such a way as to serve the purpose of speech; and not considering the nature of things abstractly, as they are considered in the categories, but with reference only to their use in language. They admit, however, of that general division of the categories into *substance* and *accidents*; and accordingly Plato and Aristotle have divided the parts of speech into these two, calling the one of them expressing Substances a *noun*, and the other expressing Accidents a *verb* *.

Words, however, though they admit of this division into classes, appear still to be infinite in number, as well as the ideas which they express. They would seem, therefore, to be altogether incomprehensible by our memories, and consequently not fit for the use of language; and they certainly would be so, if all things were to be expressed by words having no connection with one another. But science has contrived three ways of connecting words together both by sound and sense, so that the knowledge of one word naturally leads

* See vol. II. of the Origin of Language, p. 28.

leads to the knowledge of other words. And these are the three great arts of language, known by the names of *derivation*, *composition*, and *flexion**. Of these three arts I reckon *flexion* the greatest; for in nouns it expresses numbers and genders, and by its Cases the several relations which the thing expressed by the noun has to other things; and in the verb it not only expresses numbers, but persons, times, and, besides these, the dispositions of the human mind with respect to the action of the verb†. And all this is expressed by a variation only, and sometimes a very small variation of the word. But of all these three great arts of language I have said so much in the 2d volume of the Origin of Language, and likewise in the 4th (book II. chap. II.) that I need say nothing of them here, except to observe, that the barbarous languages, as they do not use these arts, are extremely defective in sense as well as in sound; and are obliged to express things, necessarily connected together, by sounds quite different; and not having learned to divide their language into parts of speech, they very often express two or three different things, such as the action, the agent, and the subject of the action, by the same word. All these defects of barbarous languages I have observed in the first volume of the Origin of Language.

Although we may have given names to all the things of which we

* See the nature of these explained in vol. II. Origin of Language, p. 12. and following.

† The variety of the flexions of a Greek verb is really wonderful. I have counted 1300 words of different significations, from one theme of a Greek verb, such as *νέμεν*, including all the tenses of the three voices, with the variations of these tenses by persons and numbers, and including also all the participles with their several genders, cases, and numbers, but without taking in the derivatives or compounds of the verb. This may appear incredible to a man who has not studied language as a science, nor has not learned to distinguish betwixt a language of art, such as the Greek, and the languages of barbarous nations. It is therefore not to be wondered, that Julius Cæsar, who was so studious of language, should even, amid his great occupations, have written a book *De Analogia*, the name the Latins gave to what we call *flexion*.—Of Cæsar's study and knowledge of language, see what I have said in vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 224, 225.; and vol. VI. p. 314.

we have any perception or idea, and although, by the three arts above-mentioned, we may have connected together a prodigious number of words, so as to make them comprehensible in the memory, and applicable to use; yet still there is something wanting to complete the art of language;—a thing of such consequence, that without it all the other things I have mentioned would be of no use for the purpose of speech. And this so necessary thing is what is called *Syntax*, by which the words are so connected together, and their relation to one another so marked, as to make *speech* or *discourse*; for if they were not so connected, though we might understand the sense of every word the speaker uses, we could not make out his meaning. This art, therefore, is, as I have said, the completion of the grammatical art; and it is performed in the learned languages chiefly by one of the three arts above-mentioned, namely, *flexion*, but in the modern languages of Europe, chiefly by *juxta-position*. But of *syntax* I will say no more here, as I have treated of it at great length in the *Origin of Language*, vol. II. book III. chap. I.

In this manner, I hope, I have convinced the reader, that language is not only an art, but the greatest as well the most useful art among men, and of most difficult invention, being a wonderful composition of what may be called the mechanical use of our organs of speech, by which articulation is formed;—of musical sounds, by which the pronunciation of language is so much adorned;—and, lastly, of science, by which it is reduced to rule and made a perfect art.

What makes many people believe that language is natural to us, is, that we learn it when we are children, and can speak it, when we are grown up, fluently and correctly, if we have been educated among people that speak it so, without knowing any thing of the art of it. But it is by imitation, not by teaching, that we learn to speak, as well as to do many other things; for man, as Aristotle has

has told us, is the most imitative of all animals: To which I will add, that he is particularly so by the voice; and in this respect he is more imitative than the monkey, who imitates only by gestures, but not by the voice. We ought also to consider, that when we are children we learn more easily by imitation, than at any other time of our lives; and, indeed, we can then learn in no other way; and, therefore, if we have not learned to speak when we are young, we cannot learn afterwards without the greatest difficulty. For proof of this, Peter the Wild Boy, being about fifteen years of age, as was conjectured, when he was caught in the woods of Hanover walking on all four, could only learn to articulate a few words, though he was put to school, and no doubt much pains bestowed to teach him, and though, as he heard as well as other men, he might by imitation have learned to speak. When such was the case of the Wild Boy, what must be the case of dumb men, who cannot learn to speak by imitation at any time of their lives, but only by teaching. In this way, indeed, they learn to a certain degree, but with the utmost difficulty, though they be men of good understanding, and very desirous to learn so useful an art. If any of my readers had seen, as I saw, the Abbé de l'Epee in France and Mr Braidwood in Scotland teach their dumb scholars to speak, he would have needed no argument to convince him, that articulation was a most artificial thing. It was taught by these masters with the greatest pains and attention; for they not only showed their scholars, by their own example, how they were to employ their organs in pronunciation, but they applied their hands to the mouths and jaws of their scholars, giving their organs the position and action which was proper.

I will only add further upon this subject, that speaking, though it be one of the most common things among men, is perhaps the most wonderful thing to be found in our species. For that a man,

who has never learned the grammatical art, nor perhaps any art, and even a boy so young as to be incapable of being taught any art or science, should, by imitation merely and habit, practise a thing of so great art as language, and practise it well too, if he has been educated among people who speak well, is to a philosopher a matter of very great wonder. Even that he should learn in that way a language, such as ours, is wonderful: But it is much more wonderful, that a boy in Athens should be able to learn, in that way, a language so difficult as the Greek, of such variety of flexion, derivation, and composition, and with melody and rhythm too so difficult, that we can only learn to understand it with a great deal of study, but not to speak it*. It can only, I think, be accounted for, by supposing that our organs of pronunciation have an instinctive movement, such as there are many in our animal economy, by which, upon hearing any articulate sounds uttered, they put themselves in a position, and make the motions, necessary for imitating these sounds;—very imperfectly, no doubt, at first, but more perfectly by continual practice for a considerable time. But for this purpose the organs must be soft and pliable, such as they are when we are young. But when we are advanced in years, and the organs become rigid and stiff, they cannot without the greatest difficulty be made to accommodate themselves to the various positions and motions which articulation requires. It was for this reason that Peter the Wild Boy could learn only to articulate a very few words. For the same reason, Baron Honton, as I have said, could not teach a Huron to pronounce the labial consonants, such as B, P, and M †, which are among the first that our children learn to pronounce: And for this reason, likewise, a Frenchman, when he is advanced in years, cannot learn to articulate our aspirated T, in such words as *thee*, *though*, *thing*, &c.

Thus

* See upon this subject, vol. III. p. 220.

† Page 111. of this vol.; and vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 502.

Thus I think it is evident, that men, who have the sense of hearing, learn to speak by imitation, and not imitation only, but much practice; for that is absolutely necessary to give us the ready use of so complicated an engine as our vocal instrument. But before any art can be learned, it must be invented; and if the practice of it be so difficult to be learned after it is invented, the invention of it must be much more difficult. It is, therefore, not to be wondered that Peter the Wild Boy could not speak when he was caught, or that the Orang Outang does not speak. But the wonder would have been, and indeed I should have thought it a miracle, if either Peter had spoken when he was first caught, or if the Orang Outangs had the use of language in the state in which they live; which is only in herds, not in a society so formed and regulated as could produce the invention of so difficult an art as language.

I have heard it said, that if the Orang Outang be a man, he is the only man that has as yet been found, who has not the use of speech. If that were true, the argument would not be conclusive; for it would only prove that he is the only man that hitherto has been found in the natural state. But the fact is not true; for Diodorus Siculus informs us*, that there was a Savage people that inhabited a country near the Red Sea, who lived in herds, copulated promiscuously, and had not the use of speech. And what must have made this people much taken notice of is another particular that he relates concerning them, and, I think, a more extraordinary thing still; namely, that they lived without the use of water, for which he accounts from their food being raw fish. In that way some barbarous people have been known to live at sea for many days without fresh water. And a gentleman whom I know, of the name of Graham, subsisted for some months in a

Q²

country

* Lib. 3. cap. 18.

country upon the side of Hudson's bay, without wood or water, and, consequently, without the use of fire, upon game which the Indians he had with him killed for him, and which he ate raw*. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt what Diodorus has told us, of these wild men not having the use of speech: And in a passage in the beginning of his history, which I have quoted elsewhere, he says of all men in general, that, while they were in the state of nature, before arts and civility were introduced among them, they had not the use of speech †.

I will conclude what I have said, at so great length, of language, with some general observations upon the subject. In the *first* place, I think I have said enough, and the reader may perhaps think more than enough, to convince every man, that language is not from nature, but a work of art, and of very great art. The use of our hands, that great instrument of the necessary arts of life, I have shown not to be from nature ‡, but one of the first steps that man made in his progress towards the arts of civil life. And if so, how can we suppose that the use of organs, hidden as those of articulation are, and of more various and artificial use than any other of our organs, should be from nature and not from art.

If there were any doubt in the matter, we must be convinced by the progress we see made in this art, as well as in others, by the barbarous nations;—from the Troglodytes mentioned by Herodotus, who, when they spoke, made a noise like bats;—from the savages whom M. de la Condamine saw upon the banks of the river Amazons, who make a muttering noise when they speak;—from the Hottentots, and the people lately discovered to the west of New Mexico,

* Vol. III. of this work, p. 32. in the note.

† Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 372. 2d edition, where I have given the words of Diodorus.

‡ Page 35. and 36. of this vol.

Mexico, who supply their want of articulation by smacks*;—and from a people in South America, whom I have not hitherto mentioned, called Chiquites†, who speak such a jargon, that the Missionaries could not learn it, nor did they well understand one another;—When, I say, we observe the progress of language from those savages to others more advanced in the art, such as those I have mentioned in chap. X. book III. of vol. I. of Origin of Language; and, when from them we proceed up to such languages as the Greek or Sanscrit, we cannot doubt that language is an art in which there has been the same progress as in other arts.

2do, That *writing*, or the making sounds visible, is a great art, nobody can doubt; and also a very useful art, as it connects the oral language with the written in such a manner, that, if we know the one, we also must know the other: Whereas in China the two languages are perfectly different; so that some nations in the neighbourhood use the written characters, or hieroglyphics as they are called, of the Chinese, though they know nothing of the Chinese oral language. But it was a greater art, and of much more difficult invention, as it must have been invented before the other, to make ideas *audible*; that is, to make the operations of our intellect perceptible by the sense of hearing, which is done by language. It is this that makes the difference betwixt language and animal cries, which express our sensations, appetites, and desires, but can communicate no ideas: And thus by art we supply what is wanting in our natural faculties.

3tio, There is another thing which I have already mentioned, but which I will mention again, as I think it more wonderful in the art of language than any thing I have hitherto mentioned. And it is this, that by means of *derivation*, *composition*, and *flexion*, by which

* See what I have said of these barbarous languages, in vol. I. of Origin of Language, book III. chap. VII. and IX.

† Memoires Geograph. Physic. et Historiq. Tom. 5. Ed. Yverdon, 1767, p. 122.

which words are connected together in the sound as well as the sense, men have contrived to make five millions of words, the number supposed to be in the Latin language*, comprehensible in their memories and of ready use. This must appear very extraordinary to a man who compares the Chinese written language with such a language as the Latin. The number of Chinese characters is computed to be no more than 80,000.; and though they have the distinction of radical or elemental characters, and of characters derived from these †, yet it is a certain fact, that the learned among the Chinese spend a great part of their lives in learning their characters; whereas a boy, in the space of seven or eight years, may make himself so much master of the Latin language, as to be able readily to understand any author in it, and even to speak it, if he practise that also.

And, here I conclude what I have to say of the *matter* and *form* of a language of art: And, I hope, the reader will not think it improper, that in treating of so important a part of the history of man, as the invention of arts, I should have dwelt so long upon the invention of the first and greatest art among men, and which is the foundation of all the other arts of civil life, and of civility itself. It is the most universal art among men, as well as the most antient; and, by means of the writing art, it is made the most lasting. The knowledge of it also leads to the knowledge of many other things concerning our species, particularly our migrations from one country to another, such as that of the Magjars, or Hungarians, as they are now called, from a country situated betwixt the Euxine and Caspian Seas to Hungary and Lapland ‡, and the migration of our ancestors, the Goths, from Crim Tartary

* This is a computation of Bishop Wilkins, in his most curious work upon language, which he gives us from Varro. See vol. II. of *Origin of Language*, p. 482.

† Pere Du Halde, Tom. 2. p. 226. See also the book I have quoted above, *Miscellaneous Pieces relating to the Chinese*, vol. I. p. 18.

‡ See vol. VI. of *Origin of Language*, p. 138.; and vol. I. p. 594.

Tartary to Germany and the northern kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark *. And there is another thing proved by language, and which is still more interesting to the philosopher; and that is the progress of the human mind in forming ideas, the materials of all our knowledge. This we learn by the study of the barbarous languages, which to many may appear a very useless and trifling study. But by it we learn what can no otherwise be learned, the progress of the human mind in the improvement of those two great faculties, the source of all our knowledge; I mean, *abstraction* and *generalisation*. How defective men were at first in the exercise of these faculties, and how by degrees they improved them, is to be learned only from the study of barbarous languages.

There is only one thing wanting to make this part of the history of man compleat; and that is, to discover in what country language was first invented and formed into an art. This is a subject of very curious inquiry, and which will be treated in the next chapter.

CHAP.

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 394.

C H A P. II.

The Question here to be considered, is, In what country or countries was a Language of Art invented?—Language not invented by every Nation that speaks it.—This proved by the examples of the Goths, the Laplanders, and the Greenlanders.—As Language is the most Antient Art among Men, it must have been invented by a very Antient Civilised Nation.—Men must have been associated, and lived upon the natural fruits of the Earth, before Language or any other Art could have been invented.—A regular Polity necessary for that purpose, and a class of Men set apart for it.—Lastly, Genius and Natural Parts required.—The Egyptian Nation, is that in which all the requisites above-mentioned for the invention of Arts, concur.

IN the preceding chapter, I think, I have clearly proved, that a Language of Art, of which only I am now speaking, is the greatest art practised by men, and of the most difficult invention, at the same time of absolute necessity for the invention of other arts and of sciences, which never could have been invented without such a communication among men, as a language of art, and only a language of art, can produce. We are now to inquire in what country or countries such an art was invented.

That it is not the invention of every people who practise it, will readily be admitted. The Goths, for example, a barbarous people, never could have invented a language of more art than any which

is at present spoken in Europe: For it has four cases of nouns formed by flexion; whereas the present languages of Europe vary, in that way, only some cases of their pronouns. It is even a more perfect language than the Latin: For it has one part of speech which the Latin wants; I mean the Article. It has also two past tenses, the aorist and preterperfect; whereas the Latin has but one tense for both: And it has a past participle passive, which the Latin likewise wants*. The language of Lapland, of which I have spoken elsewhere†, never could have been the invention of such a people as the Laplanders: And, accordingly, we are sure that it came from a very distant country lying far to the east, from whence it came first to Hungary, and then from Hungary to Lapland. The Greenlanders are still a more barbarous people than the Laplanders; and yet they have the use of a dual number in nouns, which the Latin has not, and form the tenses of their verbs by flexion, and have one tense, which the Latin has not, I mean a second future. This I learned as well as other things, which I have mentioned in the course of this work, from a grammar of that language, to be found in the King's Library at London.

As languages, therefore, were not invented in every country, but must have gone from one country to another, the question is, where they were first invented. And, in the *first* place, as language is the most antient art among men, being the parent art of all other arts and of all science, it is evident, that the nation, which first invented it, must have been a very antient nation, and the first civilised nation of this earth.

VOL. IV.

R

ado,

* This account of the Gothic language, I have got from Mr Thorkelin, who is at present Professor in the University of Copenhagen, but is a native of Iceland, where the Gothic language is still preserved in the greatest purity.—See further of the Gothic Language, in vol. I. of *Origin of Language*, p. 552.

† Vol. VI. of *Origin of Language*, p. 138.

2do, As neither language, nor indeed any art of value, could have been invented, except by men associated together in considerable numbers, and living in close intercourse and communication, it is evident that the country where language was first invented, must have been such as could enable men to live upon the natural productions of the earth, without even those arts, which we call the necessary arts of life: For that men must have lived a long time in that way, before these arts were invented, I think, is evident; and they must have lived, associated, as I have said, and in considerable numbers, otherwise, I think, no art could have been invented.

3tio, For the invention of a language of art, it was also necessary that men should live not associated only, or even carrying on some common business, but that they should have a regular polity, in which some were to command and direct, while others obeyed, so that all public business might be regularly carried on; for, I say, that men, living as the savages of Paraguay did before the Jesuits came among them, without any regular government, and every man doing what seemed good in his own eyes, never could have invented an art of any value, much less an art of language, such as the Sanscrit or Greek; for the invention of which not only a regular polity was necessary, but I think it was further necessary, that a class or order of the best men among the people should be set apart for the invention and cultivation of arts. For I hold that arts of so difficult invention as that of language, never could have arisen from common use and observation of men engaged in the ordinary business of life.

Lastly, I require, for the invention of the arts I have mentioned, that the inventors of them should be men of genius, and of very good natural parts: For Nature must lay the foundation of all arts and sciences; and I deny, that such men as the Laplanders and Greenlanders,

Greenlanders, suppose they had enjoyed all the other advantages I have mentioned, could have invented a language of art.

These are the things required for the invention of a language of art, such as, I think, it must be admitted, are not to be found in every nation which has the use of language: And the question now to be considered is, whether we can discover any very antient nation in which all the things I have mentioned concur. And, I think, there is one to be found in which they all concur; and that is the Egyptian.

R 2

CHAP.

C H A P. III.

The Egyptian nation undoubtedly a very antient civilised nation.—None can pretend to be so antient, except the Indian.—A regular Government among the Egyptians in the most antient times.—This attested by Moses.—No other regular Government then known.—Of the wonderful number of Kings there according to Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, from Menes the first human King, down to Amasis.—Of the number of years these Kings reigned.—The antient history of Egypt a matter of curiosity, as well as the antient history of Greece.—Both to be considered as part of the history of Man.—The second thing required, of a country where language was to be invented, is that it should be abundant of the natural fruits of the earth. This the case of Egypt.—The third thing required, is a regular government fitted for the invention and cultivation of arts.—This also in Egypt.—The last thing required, in a country fit for the invention of language, is that the people should have good natural parts.—This also the case of the Egyptians, as is proved by the authority of sacred and profane writers.

THAT the Egyptian was a very antient civilised nation, is a fact indisputable. The most antient civilised nation at present existing (for the antient Egyptian nation is now no more) is the Indian, by some thought to be more antient than the Egyptian: But I hope I shall be able to prove to the readers satisfaction, that the Indians got their civility and arts from the Egyptians; and if so, there can be no doubt, that the Egyptian is the most antient civilised nation of which there is any record or tradition. For their antiquity, as a civilised nation, we have the authority of Moses, the most antient historian extant, who tells us, that when Joseph was in Egypt, the Egyptians

Egyptians were living under a regular government by Kings, with a division of their land, such as is not to be found in any other antient state as far as I know, by which the Priests had a certain portion allotted to them *; and I am persuaded that the King had another portion, and that the whole land was divided in the manner mentioned by Diodorus Siculus, that is, betwixt the King, the church, and the military class†: In the same manner as by the feudal system the land was antiently divided in Britain, and in other kingdoms of Europe. And it is to be observed, that while the Egyptians were living under this so regular polity, the families of Abraham and Lot, and I suppose many other families, were vagrants in the plains of Asia, without being formed into any state. As to the account which the Egyptians themselves gave from their Sacred books, that is, books kept by their Priests, of the antiquity of their nation, we have, in Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, a wonderful catalogue of Kings from Menes the first human King, down to Amasis the last King before the Persian Conquest, not less than 345. And as to the number of years those Kings reigned, the Priests told Herodotus, that from Bacchus, one of the third and last race of their God-Kings, as they called them, down to this Amasis, there were 15,000. years; and this they said they knew exactly, by computation of the years of their several reigns, which were all set down in their books‡: So that the first thing I required in the parent country of language, existed in Egypt; I mean antient civilisation, more antient than that of any other nation known.

The

* Genesis, chap. 47. v. 22.

† Lib. 1. cap. 73.

‡ Καὶ ταῦτα Αἰγυπτίοις ἀρχαίως φασὶ πιστεῖσθαι, αὐτοὶ δὲ λογιζομένοι, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀπογραφομένοι τὰ ἔτη. Lib. 2. cap. 145. With this calculation agrees very well another chronological monument of a very extraordinary kind, and such as I believe no other nation ever had; I mean, the statues of the High Priests of Jupiter in Thebes. Of these I have spoken at some length in vol. I. of the Origin of Language, p. 625. of the second edition.

The

The second thing that I required, in the preceding chapter, for a country where language was to be invented, is that it should be a country in which men could live in considerable numbers, and in close intercourse and communication, upon the natural productions of the earth, without even those arts which we call the necessary arts of life. Now, there is no country in the world more abundant in those natural productions than Egypt: For men there can subsist, not only upon the land, but upon the river; and not only upon the fish that are taken in it, but upon vegetables which grow in it, and in the marshes*. And Herodotus tells us, that in his time there was a part of the nation who lived in the marshes upon the vegetables there produced, without agriculture †.

A third thing I have required, in the country where language was to be invented, is not only that men should be associated together, but that they should live under a regular polity: And particularly that,

The antient history of Egypt is a matter, I think, of great curiosity, and a very important part of the history of man. It is a subject upon which, and upon the antient history of Greece, I have a great many sheets in M. S. These I may some time or another publish in a volume by itself. But it would not be proper to make it any part of a work, such as the present, though it may not improperly be considered as an appendix to it. In it I will show that the Egyptian chronology, however extraordinary it may appear, is supported, as much as any chronology can be, by human monuments: And I will endeavour to account how it comes to be so different from the chronology of our Sacred Books.

* See Diodorus, lib. 1. cap. 34. and 43. where he mentions two plants, the *Lotus*, which grew in the river, and of which they made bread before they got the use of corn;—and the *Agrostis*, which grew in their marshes, upon which they fattened cattle when Diodorus was in Egypt, but upon which they lived when in a wild state: And of this their antient food, Diodorus says, the memory was preserved in their sacrifices in his time. (dist. cap. 43.).

† Lib. 2. cap. 92.

that, in such a country, a class or order of the best men among the people, should be set apart for the invention and cultivation of arts. Now, in this respect, I shall show, when I come to treat of government, that the Egyptian government was the best we have ever heard of, and particularly that it was more fitted, than any other, for the invention and cultivation of arts and sciences.

The last thing I required was, that besides a good form of polity, tending to promote arts and sciences, the people should have a genius and natural parts which made them fit for the invention and cultivation of arts and sciences. If that be wanting, though the country have all the other advantages I have mentioned, the people will make very little progress in the invention of arts and sciences. Suppose Lapland to be possessed of all the advantages which I have found in Egypt, I do not believe, that the people there could have invented any art worth mentioning: Nor, do I think, that any of the other countries of Europe, though more favoured by the sun than Lapland, could, with the genius they have, have made any considerable progress in the discovery of the liberal arts and sciences: For men of ordinary capacity may be taught or may learn by imitation; but to invent requires more than ordinary understanding. Now, that understanding the Egyptians had; and were acknowledged, even by the Greeks, to be men of superior parts, as appears from several passages in Herodotus, particularly from that where he relates how the Elians consulted them about the way they should determine to whom the prizes of their games were to be adjudged*. Moses, we are told in our Scripture, was *learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians*†: And it is said of Solomon's wisdom, that it *excelled all the wisdom of Egypt*‡. The Greeks, however,

called

* Herod. lib. 2. cap. 160.

† Acts of the Apostles, cap. 7. v. 22.

‡ I. Kings, cap. 4. v. 30.

called the Egyptians as well as other nations, *barbarians*; and so the Egyptians called them, for this reason, as Herodotus tells us*, that they spoke a language different from theirs; and it is in this sense that Homer has used the word, when, speaking of a people who fought at Troy, he says they were βαρβαροφωνοί†.

And thus I think I have proved, that Egypt was, of all the countries we have heard of, the most proper for the invention of language, and of arts and sciences.

* Herod. lib. 2. cap. 158.

† Iliad, 2. v. 867.

CHAP.

C H A P. IV.

Of the necessity of Arts being invented in Egypt.—Other Arts mentioned as invented in Egypt, besides the Art of Language:—And, first Agriculture, by which only Men could subsist in the same place in considerable numbers, and so have a close communication together.—Before this Art was invented, the Egyptians ate one another; and so did the Greeks.—This Art came from Egypt to other Countries, and particularly to Attica.—The Art also of making Drink, as well as Food, for Men, invented in Egypt, viz. the Art of Fermentation, by which both Wine and Ale are produced.

IN a country so fitted by nature, and the genius of its inhabitants, for the invention and cultivation of arts and sciences, and at the same time the most antient civilised country that we read of, it was necessary that many arts and sciences should be invented; and I am now to show, that among others was invented the art of language, the foundation of all arts and sciences. But before I come to speak of it particularly, I will give an account of other arts and sciences that were invented in Egypt, the original country, in my opinion, of all arts and sciences. I will begin with Agriculture, which may be said to be the parent art, which has produced all other arts, and all sciences: For the practice of this art makes it necessary that men should live together in one place and in considerable numbers; and by the fruits it produces, it enables them to do so. Accordingly, the Egyptians lived by means of this art in greater numbers than I believe ever any people did in the same extent of country, and likewise in the closest communication and intercourse; for they lived in cities. Now, it is only people so associated, and

with such communication and intercourse, who are capable of inventing arts and sciences: For the men who lead the nomade life, and subsist upon the natural fruits of the earth, or like the beasts of prey, upon what they can catch by hunting, though they may have got the use of language from other countries, never can invent any art worth the mentioning, and no science at all; and the reason is plain, that they must go from place to place in search of food, and cannot have that close communication and intercourse, by which alone the human mind is cultivated, and made capable of producing arts and sciences. And though they had the capacity of inventing them, which I think they could not have, they are so much employed in procuring subsistence, that they have not time for it. For in every country where arts and sciences are to be invented and cultivated, there must be men who have leisure for that purpose, and are exempted from the necessity of procuring subsistence for themselves, which was the case of the Priests in Egypt. And, accordingly, there is no example in the history of mankind of men living the nomade life, inventing any art or science, though they may have had the use of some arts, which they got from other nations leading the sedentary life.

Before Agriculture was invented, the Egyptians lived upon the natural produce of their land and river, which, I have observed elsewhere, was more abundant in Egypt than in any other country whatever*. And there were particularly two plants upon which they chiefly fed before they discovered the use of corn. These were the *Lotus*, and a plant they called, *Agrostis*; both I believe the gift of the river, which the *Lotus* certainly was. The *Agrostis* in later times was used for fattening cattle: But the memory of its having been used for the food of men was preserved in their solemn sacrifices†. Men multiplied, as it appears, so fast, that the natural

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 649. and 650.

† See Diodorus Siculus concerning this plant, lib. 1. cap. 34. where he speaks also of the *Lotus*, of which he says they made bread.

tural fruits of the country, however abundant, could not maintain them. And, therefore, as Diodorus informs us*, they ate one another: So that, even the Egyptians, the most antient and best civilised nation of the world, as, I think, I shall prove in the sequel of this work, were once as barbarous man-eaters as the people of Paraguay; and so were the Greeks, (the finest nation in the world, in my opinion, next to the Egyptians), as Horace tells us, when Orpheus came from Egypt to civilise them†. This shows that barbarity, and even the eating one another, when other food cannot be found, is a necessary step in the progress of men from the natural to the civilised life; and that it is only by arts, and a regular polity, that men can be tamed and humanised, as the Paraguaise were by the Jesuits.

In this barbarous way the Egyptians lived, till Isis, the sister and wife of Osiris, discovered wheat and barley, which, as Diodorus tells us, were the natural produce of the country, (as I am inclined to believe, every plant which the earth produces was to be found in a country so fruitful as Egypt), and grew with other herbs, but were not known by the inhabitants till Isis discovered them as plants the most proper for nourishing men‡; the memory of

§ 2

which

* Diodorus, lib. 1. cap. 14.

† See p. 95. of this volume, where I quote two lines of Horace, to which may be added, the third following,

Dictus ab hoc lenire tygres rabidosque leones;

for, I think, the Greeks when Orpheus came among them, as the Paraguaise before they were civilised by the Jesuits, may be very properly compared to tygers and lions; and, indeed, men in such a state, are, by their natural sagacity, with the addition of some arts, which they may have invented or got from other countries, animals more formidable than tygers and lions.

‡ Diodorus, lib. 1. cap. 14.

which was preserved in Egypt, even in his time, by offering to this Goddess the first fruits of these plants, in the beginning of their harvest. Diodorus, it may be observed, mentions only wheat and barley. But there was another grain in Egypt, which they called *Zea*, and which, as the Halicarnassian tells us, was the *Far* of the Romans. This grain was a much finer grain than the common wheat, though I believe of the same genus; for which reason it is likely that it is not distinguished by Diodorus from wheat. But Herodotus has made the distinction, and informed us, that the better sort of people in Egypt ate no bread but what was made of the *Zea* or *Olyron*, as it was likewise called*. Whether these plants were then produced in any other country in the world, I will not take upon me to determine, though I incline to believe that they were not. But one thing is certain, that the culture of them first began in Egypt, and from thence was carried to different parts of the world†. So that the bread we eat at present, I am persuaded, we owe to this Goddess Isis, or Ceres, as she was called by the Romans,

—cujus munere tellus
Chaoniam pingui glandem mutavit arista ‡.

for, in other countries, where they had not such plants as the *lotus* and the *agrostis*, the men were obliged to live upon acorns, as we are told the Arcadians did in antient times, and no doubt many more nations did, in countries where they could find that fruit.

The first people in Europe, that this gift of the Goddess came to,
were

* Herod. lib. 2. cap. 36.

† The finest kind of wheat, or *Zea*, is not to be found at present, as I am informed, any where in Europe except in Sicily. From thence I wonder that we do not get the seed of it, and try to cultivate it in Britain.

‡ *Georgic*. Virgil. in initio.

were the Athenians, to whom the seeds of the several corns, I have mentioned, were brought by an Egyptian woman, whom the Athenians made to be Ceres herself; and perhaps she might have assumed that name. She instituted those most respectable mysteries called the Elufinian. From Athens corn was sent to the several cities of Greece, which was acknowledged by an annual oblation of their first fruits, sent by those cities to Athens*.

As by Isis a plant was discovered which furnished bread to man, so by Osiris, her husband and brother, an art was invented of making a drink for man. This art is what is called *fermentation*, which he applied to the juice of the grape; and so first made wine, which though it has been very much abused, (as almost every production of nature and art has been by man), and therefore is very properly stilled by Milton, *The sweet poison of misused Wine*, may be applied to the most useful purposes; for it is the best cordial of old age, and at all times of life it enlivens the spirits, and therefore Bacchus is called by Virgil, *Letitiæ dator*, and it cherishes the stomach. But it is a great abuse of this liquor in modern times, to drink it pure without mixture of water, which I am sorry to observe so much practised in Britain, where port, a wine full as strong as the best Greek wine, the Chian, (as I am informed by a gentleman who has been in Greece, and often drank of that wine), is drunk without any mixture of water, which makes it very inflammatory and intoxicating: Whereas wine, properly mixed with water, is a much better drink than pure water, for it corrects the coldness and crudity of the water, and I am persuaded invigorates the stomach, and makes it more easily digest that unnatural diet, as I call it, *flesh*. It is therefore true what Solomon has said, *That wine without water is not good, nor water without wine; but both together make an*
excellent

* Isocratis, *Panegyric*.

excellent drink *. The antient Greeks and Romans, as they did not drink wine without water, so neither did they drink water without wine, if they could get wine; and the Roman soldier, who could not afford wine, rather than drink pure water, mixed vinegar with it, and made of it a liquor called *Posca*. Virgil therefore has very properly described the use of wine, when, speaking of Bacchus, he has said,

Poculaque inventis Achelœa miscuit uvis.

The antient Greeks therefore never drank it pure, even in the heroic ages, when they were so much bigger and stronger than in after times: The Romans also mixed it with water; and Horace calls loudly for it,

Quis puer ocyus

Restinguet ardentis Falerni

Pocula prætereunte lympba? — OD. 11. LIB. 1.

nor do we hear of a Vitellius, a Heliogabalus, or any other of their most luxurious Emperors, drinking pure wine. In those antient times, therefore, it was only Scythians or other barbarians who drank pure wine: And we read of a Scythian†, who, happening to be at Sparta, became acquainted with one of the Kings, whom he taught to drink pure wine; the consequence of which was, that, though he was of the race of Hercules, the strongest race of men then known in the world, he died raving mad, and tearing his own flesh.

There was another fermented liquor invented in Egypt, whether by Osiris or by whom else I cannot tell; but it is well known to us under the name of *ale* or *beer*, a liquor made of barley, which, before it is fermented, undergoes a process, a greater discovery, I think, than even fermentation; I mean the operation of malt-ing, by which the grain is in some degree putrified; and hence it

was

* The last verse of the Apocrypha.

† Herodot. lib. 6, cap. 84.

was called by the Romans, *Vinum ex corruptis frugibus*. It was the drink of the common people in Egypt, where wine was scarce, the ground being all employed in producing corn to maintain such numbers of men. And thus it appears, that we owe to the Egyptians, not only *corn* and *wine*, but also *ale*.

CHAP.

C H A P. V.

Of the invention of Clothes.—These not necessary in the Natural Life.—The first Clothing among Men were Skins.—The country of Egypt maintaining so many Men, could not likewise maintain so many Beasts as were necessary for furnishing Skins to Cloth so many People.—Therefore Clothing by Linen invented;—also by Cloth made of Wool;—for both these Clothings, the Arts of Spinning and Weaving were necessary.—The use of Linen went from Egypt to few countries.—To the Egyptians therefore we owe not only our Bread, our Wine, and our Beer, but our Cloths.—The Egyptians must have discovered the use of Fire for the practice of those Arts.—This discovery not made by all nations in the first ages of Civility.—Of the Art of Building invented in Egypt:—Metallurgy necessary for the practice of that Art.—The Egyptians made the subject of their art, not only every thing on the earth, and in the air and water, but what was in the bowels of the earth.—The way that Men were supplied with instruments of peircing hard substances, before the invention of Metals.—Division of Time into certain portions necessary in Civilised Life.—The first division of time into Days, that is, the interval from one rising of the Sun to his rising again.—The next portion of Time, observed by Men, was from one new moon to another, called from thence a Month.—This the only division of Time known to barbarous nations.—The Solar Year first discovered in Egypt.—That year, as first used by the Greeks and Romans, very irregular.—The Romans got the irregularity of their year corrected from Egypt.—What was wanting to make that correction perfectly accurate, supplied by Pope Gregory XIII.—Of the division of time into Weeks.—This invented

ed in Egypt, and by the Egyptians carried to India.—From the Egyptians it came to Greece, and from Greece to us.

IN this chapter I will continue the account, I began in the last, of those arts of life invented in Egypt, which are necessary for man in the civilised state. Of Agriculture, the great art of that kind, I have treated in the last chapter; of the produce of which, *Corn*, I have shown that the Egyptians taught both to make food and drink. I am now to speak of some other arts, invented in Egypt, which are likewise necessary in the civilised life. And I will begin with *Cloaths*, which are not necessary in the natural state, as it is now well known, that men go naked in the coldest climates, such as that of an island a degree further south than the Straits of Magellan, where Sir Francis Drake saw men without cloaths. The first cloathing used by men was undoubtedly the skins of beasts; and in that way Adam and Eve were first cloathed. But the Egyptians contrived to make cloathing of a vegetable, I mean, *Flax*, of which they made what is so much celebrated in scripture, under the name of *the fine linen of Egypt*; the use of which is now so prevalent in Europe, that the meanest of the people not only wear it through the day, but sleep in it at night. But to the Greeks and Romans it was not at all known, and Augustus Caesar had not a linen shirt upon his back; nor in antient times does it appear, that this discovery went to any other nation except the Jews. In Egypt it was absolutely necessary that they should have such a cloathing, as the country, maintaining so many men, could not at the same time support so many beasts as were necessary for cloathing the tenth part of the people. The Egyptians at the same time knew also the use of wool for cloathing, and used woollen cloth as well as linen: But for making both it was necessary that they should invent the art of spinning and weaving. To them therefore we owe our Cloathing, as well as our Bread, our Wine and Beer.

As Egypt was the first civilized country, I think it is certain that the Egyptians must have first discovered the use of *fire*, without which none of the arts of Vulcan or Minerva could have been practised. That it was not known to all nations, even in the first ages of civilization, and after they had learned the use of speech, is evident from the example of the men of the Ladrone Islands, who had not the use of it when they were first discovered by the Europeans: And the Wild Girl, I saw in France, told me that they had no use of it in her country*. But whether the antient Egyptians had learned to strike fire out of the veins of flint, to use an expression of Virgil, which the Chinese have not learned at this day, does not appear.

Not only were bread, and wine, and beer, which are used in the civilized life, and also cloaths, invented by the Egyptians, but likewise *houses* and other buildings of stone, of which wonderful monuments are still to be seen in Egypt. Before the invention of houses, men lodged in caves, or dug for themselves habitations in rocks†, such as those to be seen at this day in some parts of the world, particularly in the Island of Elephantis off the coast of Bombay‡. But before the Egyptians could raise buildings of stone, they must have discovered, as I have said, the use of *fire*, and learned the practice of Metallurgy. So that, not content with converting to their use every thing that the land, the water, and air furnished, they dug into the bowels of the earth, and from thence, besides many other things, they brought metals, of which,

* Of the use of fire being unknown to several nations, see p. 38. of vol. III. of this work.

† See p. 44 of this vol.

‡ See further what I have said on this subject, in vol. III. of this work, p. 83. where I have acknowledged, that what I have learned concerning that island, I owe to Dr Lind now of Windsor, who showed me a plan of the extraordinary excavations there.

which, by a wonderful application of the element of fire, they made a variety of things both of ornament and use. Before this discovery, men, for the purpose of cutting and piercing, used the hardest stones they could find, such as flints; and the barbarous nations at this day head their arrows with flints, which was the practice in Scotland in antient times as well as in other countries; and I have myself a flint head of an arrow, found in the Pentland Hills near Edinburgh.

For carrying on the business of civil life, and particularly of agriculture, the observance of times and seasons is necessary, and for that purpose the division of time into certain portions. The most obvious division, and no doubt the first that was made by men, is into *days*; that is the interval of time from the rising of the sun in one day, to his rising again the next day; which we divide into twenty-four parts called hours. But a greater division of time was necessary for the business of life: And therefore the next division of it, made by man, was by the motions of the moon, containing that space of time betwixt the one new moon and the other; which we call a *month*: And the barbarous nations appear to have gone no farther, than to divide their time by months and by seasons; for none of them, unless they have learned it from us, know that division of time we call a *year*. This so important division, without which we could have had no chronology of any extent of time, was first invented by the Egyptians, as Herodotus has told us*. They discovered that the course of the sun round the earth, or, what is the same thing, of the earth round the sun, is performed in 365 days and 6 hours, which hours every fourth year make a day more, that was added to that year. And here we are to observe, that though the Egyptians did not lay aside the division of time into months, it was not lunar months, but months such as we

T 2

use,

* Lib. 2. chap. 4.

use, each of a certain number of days : Whereas the Greeks, dividing the year into twelve lunar months of about 29 days each, were obliged, in order to adjust their year to the motions of the sun, to intercalate a month every third year *. And among the Romans, Numa for the same reason intercalated a month of 22 days every two years †. But notwithstanding this reformation made by Numa, the Roman calendar went into such disorder, that Julius Caesar, in order to rectify it, was obliged to intercalate, first 23 days, and then 67, making altogether an intercalation of no less than 90 days ‡; and having thus adjusted the year to the course of the sun, in order to prevent its going into disorder again, he adopted the Egyptian year as above described. This reformation of the Roman calendar, Julius made by the directions of Sosigenes, an Egyptian astronomer, who came from Alexandria; and it is this year which is now used all over Europe, with a small alteration made in it, in the 16th century, by Pope Gregory XIII. What made this alteration necessary was, that the 6 hours added, as said is, to the 365 days, exceeded the solar year by 11 minutes. This excess, in the course of so many centuries, made a disconformity betwixt the solar and civil year, which was rectified by that Pope; and it is said, that Julius Caesar, if he had lived longer, would have made that amendment himself, by the direction, no doubt, of the same Sosigenes. So that the Egyptians knew the true solar year to a minute; and thus it appears, that to them we owe, among many other things, the discovery of the solar year, and the division of it into months, which are adapted to the seasons of the year; so that the same months are always vernal, summer, autumnal, and winter months.

The Egyptians had another division of time, unknown to the Greeks

* Herodotus, *ubi supra*.

† Gebelin, vol. IV. p. 153.

‡ Ibid. p. 163.

Greeks and Romans till later times: I mean the division into weeks; which was carried by Osiris into India, where it is at this day in use; and, what is very remarkable, the seven days of the week are in India not only consecrated to the seven planets, but each day to the same planet as among us. But this division of time was for many ages only known to the Egyptians, Jews, and Indians; but not to the Greeks till latter times, as Dion Cassius informs us; and from them we got it. I will only add further upon this subject, that this so singular division of time, which was not founded in the necessities of life, like the other divisions that I have mentioned, but took its rise from the religion of the Egyptians, who, as Herodotus tells us, consecrated every day to some deity or another, being used in India, is a proof I think demonstrative, if there were no other, that the Egyptians were in India. But of this, I shall say a great deal more in the sequel of this work.

CHAP.

C H A P. VI.

Of Religion, and the necessity of it to constitute and carry on a good polity.—The opinion of Mr David Hume upon this subject, very different from that of Cicero.—Religion not known to Man in his natural state,—nor in the first age of civility.—This proved, first by Reason, and then by Facts,—and first as to Reason.—It shows that Man in the natural state can have no ideas at all; and, in the beginning of civility, only ideas of corporeal substances,—but no ideas of invisible powers acting upon body, without which there can be no idea of God.—This idea only to be acquired in process of time after the invention of different arts.—Secondly as to Facts; it is proved by the example of the Orang Outang,—Peter the Wild Boy,—the Wild Girl in France,—the people of the Pelew Islands,—those of New Zealand—of New Holland, and particularly of Botany Bay.—Objection answered, from the example of the Indians of North America, who have got the notion of a great spirit.—This they must have got from a people further advanced in arts and civility, who are proved by monuments still existing to have been once in that country.—That the idea of a God, is not an innate idea;—no innate ideas of any kind.

IN the preceding chapter I have treated of arts, which are absolutely necessary, or of great conveniency in the civilised life: And I am next to speak of two things, which are of absolute necessity for constituting and carrying on a regular polity. The two things I mean are *Religion* and *Government*; and first as to Religion. “The fear of God,” as our scripture tells us, “is the beginning
“ of

"of wisdom." Without that fear, I hold, there is no real wisdom or sound understanding among men; and, therefore, that, without religion, there never was nor ever will be formed, or carried on, any polity in the least degree perfect.—So far I differ in opinion from our philosopher Mr. David Hume, who has thought proper to inform the public, that the less religion there is in any country, so much the better for that country*. Cicero was so much of a different opinion, that he thought the chief praise he could bestow upon his countrymen, was, that, however they might be excelled by other nations in other things which he names, *sed pietate ac religione, atque hac una sapientia, quod Deorum immortalium numine omnia regi gubernarique perspeximus, omnes gentes nationesque superavimus* †. And I am persuaded it was to their religion chiefly that they owed the conquest of the world: For it was their religion, and particularly their most religious regard to an oath, which made them so good citizens and soldiers ‡.

I am, however, of opinion, that religion was not known to man in his natural state, nor even in the first ages of civility, but was discovered by him, like other things, in process of time, as he improved in understanding. And this is a truth not only proved by fact and observation, as I shall afterwards show, but I think is evident from theory, and may be demonstrated in this manner.

Men in the mere natural state have no ideas at all, but only the capacity of forming them. They have therefore only the perceptions of sense. From these perceptions, when they are a little advanced in civility and arts, they form, by abstraction and generallisation, ideas in the manner I have elsewhere shown §. But their first ideas were only of

* See vol. II. of this work, p. 301.; and see further concerning the philosophy of Mr Hume, vol. I. p. 309.

† Oratio, *de Haruspicum responsis*.

‡ See what I have further said on this subject, in vol. V. of *Origin of Language*, p. 9.

§ Page 65. and 66. of this volume

of corporeal substances, and of their operations upon one another. In this way, they discovered a difference of bodies, and that one body acts upon another. But it is impossible that at first they can have any idea of an invisible and immaterial principle acting upon body, and in that way conducting the operations of nature, and influencing the affairs of human life. Now, a man who has no idea of this kind, can have no religion, which can only come in process of time, by observing that there are invisible powers infinitely superior to any power that he can exert, by which all the wonderful phenomena of nature are produced. It may be said that man, by considering himself and his own powers of action, might discover that there was an invisible power within himself, which moved him to action. But a savage cannot practise that precept of the wise man in Greece, *Know thyself*, which was inscribed on the frontispiece of the temple at Delphi, and was understood to be an address by the God to those who came to visit his temple*. Some I am afraid, even of our modern philosophers, know so little of themselves, as not to know that the principle, which moves their bodies, is an immaterial principle†. Religion therefore must have come among men only in process of time, after they had lived together for a considerable time in a well regulated society, and had not only invented some of the necessary arts of life, but had learned to reason and to speculate upon causes and effects. And indeed, to me it is inconceivable, how a creature only capable of intellect, which is the case of man in his natural state, should immediately upon acquiring the use of it, without the exercise of it for some considerable time upon different subjects, form an idea of the Supreme Intelligence, or of intelligences superior to his own, or even of his own.

This

* See p. 8. of this vol. See also Plutarch in his Treatise upon the Inscription of EI. on the entry to the temple at Delphi.

† Vol. V. of Origin of Language, p. 422. and 423.

This theory of mine is supported by facts: The Orang Outang has certainly no religion; and if the reader be not yet convinced of his being a man, Peter the Wild Boy, of whose humanity there never was any doubt, had no idea of a God *, though he was tamed and domesticated, and lived very quietly in a family, where I saw him, and had learned a little language. Him, however, as well as the Orang Outang, I consider in the natural state. The Savage Girl, whom I saw in France, came from a country where they not only had the use of language, but practised some of the arts of life, particularly fishing, in the natural way indeed, I mean by their hands, but so that they lived by it. But, from the conversations I had with her, I could not learn that they had the least idea of religion. And the people of the Pelew Islands, though much farther advanced in the arts of life, have none neither, as far as we could discover during the 13 weeks we were among them; though, during that time, we appear to have informed ourselves of their government, and the arts of war and navigation which they practise; and as there is no religion in any nation, without religious ceremonies and forms of worship, these we must have also observed, if there had been any such among them. The people of New Zealand appear to be still farther advanced in the arts of life; for they have not only the use of language, but are orators and public speakers †, and are a generous noble-minded people, as well as the Pelew men; yet neither have we discovered any religion among them. The Indian nations of North America have notions of religion, which they carry so far as to acknowledge a *Great Spirit*, in whose name they make their treaties of peace. But, in the first place, I say, those nations are much farther advanced in the arts of civil life than any of the people above-mentioned; and, *secondly*, I say, that even this further progress would not have carried them on to the conception of a Supreme Being, if they had not learned it from a people much

VOL. IV.

U

farther

* See p. 371. of vol. III. of this work.

† See p. 4. of vol. VI. of *Origin of Language*.

farther advanced in arts and sciences, who appear once to have inhabited the country of North America. Of such a people, memorials have been observed by travellers in that country, particularly by Adair, who was 40 years there, trading with the different nations of North America, and appears to me to be a man of veracity and accurate observation. He says, in his history of the American Indians *, that, in certain parts of North America, there are to be seen plates of copper and of brass, to the number of seven, five of copper and two of brass; and particularly of the brass, he says, that they are round in their shape like a medal, and have upon them two stars and an alphabetical character, at least it so appears, resembling the character by which we mark the *Æ* diphthong in Latin. This Author likewise speaks † of the remains of regular encampments to be seen in this country: And the same was observed by Carver, when he was there, as he has related in his travels through the interior parts of North America ‡.

Thus I have proved both *a priori* by the reason of the thing, and *a posteriori* by facts, that religion does not belong to man in his natural state, and not even in the first ages of civility, but that he acquires it, as he does arts and sciences, by the cultivation of his intellectual faculties. There are some, I know, who think that the idea of a God, is an innate idea in man. But such men do not know, any more than Mr Locke and Mr David Hume, what ideas are, but confound them with sensations; from which, no doubt, our ideas are formed in the manner I have elsewhere described, (for in this state of our existence, all our knowledge arises from our senses); but they are quite different from our sensations, as different as intellect is from sense, generals from particulars, and man from brute.

CHAP.

* Adair, p. 178.

† Ibid. 377.

‡ Carver, p. 56.

C H A P. VII.

Impossible that the Egyptians, who had invented so many arts and sciences, should not have been Religious — They were the most Religious of all Nations. Religion here considered as a Political Institution, which produced no bad effects among the Egyptians, as it has done in many other Nations. — If it produced no bad effects, where there was so much of it as in Egypt, it must have produced good effects. — Difference betwixt the Religion of Egypt and that of other Countries. — In other countries the Gods only predicted events; in Egypt they were Kings, and Governed. — Of the nature of the Egyptian Gods. — They were embodied, were born, and died; and were of different Characters. — They were of that class of Beings called Demons. — This opinion supported by the authority of Plutarch, Plato, and other Authors quoted by him. — Proved from theory that such Beings as Demons must exist, otherwise there would be a void in the universe, which cannot be supposed to be in so perfect a System. — Agreeable to the wisdom and goodness of God, that such Beings should be sent among men, to assist them to recover from their fallen State, by teaching them Arts and Sciences. — This was done by the Demons in Egypt. — This happened in other countries as well as in Egypt, particularly in China and in Peru. — In Peru there was an Osiris and an Isis, under the name of Manco Capac and his Sister-wife. — Authorities from Scripture to prove the existence of Demons. — They may be supposed to have been the Beings called, in Scripture, Angels, who had the superintendency of human affairs. — Each Nation had its Angel. — A bad translation of a text on this subject in our Bible. — The Sons of God, who, we are told, copulated with the Daughters of Men, must have been Demons. — This in-

terpretation of the text supported by the authority of the Fathers of the Church.—It was natural that those Demons in Egypt should be the objects of Popular Worship there;—but the Learned Egyptians made a distinction betwixt the Popular Religion and the Religion of Philosophers.—Proof of this from their knowing the doctrine of the Trinity.—A great deal of Rites, Ceremonies, and Pomp in the Popular Religion of Egypt.—The same in the Religions of Greece and Rome;—also in the Religion of the Jews.—Proof of this from Scripture.—Music a considerable part of the Religion of all Antient Nations;—very much attended to by the Egyptians.—The Antient Music among them carefully preserved.—Of the Oracles in Egypt.—By them only the Egyptians divined.—From them Oracles came to Greece, but not to the Romans, who divined only by the Flight of Birds and Entrails of Beasts.—Of the Egyptian Oracles.—These were given by the Demons who had Reigned over them;—difference in that respect betwixt the Oracles of Egypt and of Greece, as well as betwixt the Gods of Egypt and of Greece.—Of the deceit and imposture of the Greek Oracles.—Of the Sacred Animals among the Egyptians.—These were types of their Divinities.—Better representations of Divinity than any thing inanimate, such as Brass or Stone.—By means of these Sacred Animals, the Egyptians lived with their Gods, more than any other People;—and were the most Religious of all People;—and also the Happiest.—Observations upon the difference betwixt the Religion of the Philosopher and the Vulgar.—A Religion of contemplation, such as that of the Philosopher, not fit for an uninstructed Mind.

HAVING shown in the preceding chapter, that men must not only have been civilised, but have made some progress in arts and sciences before they could be religious, in this chapter I propose to inquire concerning the religion of Egypt.

That

That men, who had constituted so perfect a polity, as I shall show the Egyptian was, who had also invented those arts which I have shown the Egyptians invented, and other arts and likewise sciences, of which I shall speak in the sequel, should not have discovered, that there were, in this universe, beings of power and of wisdom infinitely superior to man, is a thing very impossible, and indeed, in my apprehension, absolutely incredible. But the matter does not rest upon theory or argument: For it is a fact uncontravertible, that they were a most religious nation, I believe as religious a nation as ever existed: Herodotus says, the most religious of all nations*.

Whether their religion was what may be called a true religion, is not the business of this part of my work to inquire; for I here consider religion only as a political institution; and I inquire, *first*, Whether religion among the Egyptians produced such bad consequences, as it is known to have produced among other nations, such as that abomination of human sacrifices, which we know were practised in other nations, particularly among the Carthaginians †, likewise among the Greeks, the Cananites, and even the Jews. But among the Egyptians, such an abomination was abhorred, and was never practised, as Herodotus has told us ‡. In other nations religion has produced, particularly in modern times, great disorders in the state, civil wars, persecutions, and massacres. But we hear of no such effects of religion in Egypt. *Secondly*, If religion, so much as there was in Egypt, produces no bad effects, it must necessarily produce some good; for it is impossible that it can be a thing indifferent. I therefore hold it to be certain, that the piety of the Egyptians must have had a great effect upon their morals, and made them better citizens and subjects than otherwise they would have been; for

* Lib. 2. cap. 37.

† Diodorus, lib. 20. cap. 24. where he tells us, that the Carthaginians, upon one occasion, sacrificed 500 children, of their noblest families, to appease the wrath of Saturn.

‡ Lib. 2. cap. 119.

for they believed, as much as any people ever did, in a *present* *diety*; and may be said to have lived with their Gods.

In one respect the Egyptian religion differed from any other that we read of. In other countries their Gods predicted events, and in that way governed the councils of the kings and rulers: But in Egypt their Gods, in very antient times, were their kings: And there were three races of them, as Herodotus tells us; the first, consisting of *eight* Gods; the second, of *twelve*; and the third, and last, of *three*; and after them came their human Kings, of whom the first was Menes. And this leads to a curious inquiry, what kind of beings these God-kings, as they called them, were.

And, in the *first* place, it is certain, that they had bodies, such as we have, and were not immortal, but died as we do, though their life was much longer. *Secondly*, As they died, so they were born, and were produced in the ordinary way by generation; but they mixed in that way only with one another: From the first race therefore proceeded the second; and from the second the third, in the common way of generation. They did not therefore mix with the women of the country, and beget Heroes, as the Greek Gods did; for Heroes were not known among the Egyptians; and Herodotus tells us, that they did not live with the men of the country, but among themselves. *Thirdly*, Though they were neither Gods nor immortal, they were much superior to men in council and intelligence. And, *lastly*, they were not all of them good and virtuous beings, but one of them was a murderer and a villain, he who was called Typhon.

To what class of beings then shall we say they belonged, and what name shall we give them? And I think Plutarch has very properly described and named them, when he says, that they were
not

not Gods, but *Demons*, that is, beings intermediate betwixt Gods and men. This opinion he gives after informing us, that there were some, who thought that they were mere men, who assumed divine honours, and were considered as Gods by the Egyptians, on account of the many benefits they had conferred on them by the discovery of so many arts. His own opinion he supports by the authority of Plato, Pythagoras *, Xenocrates, and Chrysippus, who, in conformity with the antient theologists, maintained that such beings existed, much superior to man, and participated, in some degree, of the divine nature, but not pure and unmixed. Plato, he tells us, says, that they were placed in the middle betwixt Gods and men, and kept up a communication betwixt these two, carrying to the Gods the prayers and supplications of men, and bringing from the Gods, to men, predictions of future events, and gifts of good things. And he quotes Empedocles, the philosopher, who says, that some of those *Dæmons* were wicked, and committed crimes, which they expiated by certain punishments; and then they recovered the rank they had lost †. After this, Plutarch gives us the opinions of those philosophers, who allegorised the Egyptian divinities, such as Isis and Osiris, and interpreted them to denote parts and powers of nature ‡. But the allegories of those authors he rejects, and gives what he himself thinks a better allegory §; for allegorising had come much into fashion at the time that Plutarch wrote; so that both the Egyptian and Greek theology were allegorised;

* That it was the opinion of Pythagoras, that there was a class of beings that dwelt on earth, but were of a nature superior to man, is evident from the *aurea carmina* of Pythagoras, in which they are called, *δαίμονες κατὰ γῆν*, (v. 2.) and the commentary of Hierocles upon that verse, p. 38. edit. Needham.

† Plutarch, de *Iside et Osiride*, p. 360. and 361. of the Paris edition, vol. II.

‡ Ibid. p. 363.

§ Ibid. p. 373.

allegorised; and in later times even historical facts; and there is a late French writer who has made Romulus, the first King of Rome, to be a symbol of the sun. But that those Dæmon Kings of Egypt were real personages as much as Menes, their first human King, neither Herodotus nor Diodorus Siculus appear to have the least doubt; nor Plutarch himself, as he has told us in express terms, that they were Dæmons, and held a middle place betwixt Gods and men. So that I hold the reign of the Gods in Egypt to be as much a part of the antient history of that country, as the reigns of their human Kings, and attested in the same manner by the books of the priests.

That such beings as Dæmons do exist, is, I think, evident from theory, though it were not attested by history; for it is impossible to suppose, that the great interval betwixt an intellectual creature such as man, and the supreme intelligence, should not be filled up by intelligences superior to man, but inferior by infinite degrees to the supreme. Some of these we may suppose to be cloathed with such bodies as ours, which was the case of the Egyptian Dæmon Kings. Others we may suppose to be, like the Dæmons mentioned by Hesiod, cloathed with aerial bodies, *αἶρα ὑγραμμῶς*, as he expresses it*, and who, he says, were the guardians and benefactors of men; and others we may suppose with no bodies at all, but to be pure immaterial substances. If in this way the immense interval betwixt God and man was not filled up, there would be a great gap in the system of the universe; and things would not be connected together, the higher with the lower, which must be the case in every perfect system, such as that of the universe certainly is; and so far as we can observe on the earth, every thing is connected with every thing, as I have elsewhere observed†; and the more we observe of the variety of nature, the more we ought to be convinc-

ed

* Hesiodi, *Opera et Dies*.

† Page 18. and 19. of this volume.

ed of the truth of what Aristotle has told us, that every thing, which is possible to exist, that is, which does not imply a contradiction to the nature of things, does actually exist; for, otherwise, that possibility or capacity of existence would be in vain. Now, the same author tells us, that as there is nothing deficient in the system of the universe, so there is nothing superfluous.

Moreover, I am of opinion, that it was agreeable to the wisdom and goodness of God, that Man should, in the first ages after his fall, have the assistance of such beings as the Egyptian Daemon-Kings were, in order to enable him to recover in some degree from his fallen state even in this life. And, accordingly, I am convinced, that all the arts and sciences invented in Egypt derive their origin from those Dæmon-Kings, some of whom are mentioned as the inventors of certain arts; such as Isis and Osiris, of agriculture, and Theuth, or the Hermes of the Greeks and the Mercury of the Latins, of the art of language, as I shall afterwards observe. Nor was it in Egypt only that Providence interposed in this extraordinary way for the good of man. It is preserved in the traditions of the Chinese, that while they were in the savage state, a man appeared among them, whom they called *the Son of Heaven*: And, in their religious processions, they show the figures of twenty-four men, whom they call *immortals*. Now these with the Son of Heaven, as they called him, we may, I think, with great probability, suppose to have been Dæmons, who, like those in Egypt, civilised the people, and gave them laws; and for that reason are remembered, and have those honours done them. Manco Capuc, the first Inka of Peru, and his sister-wife, have a very great resemblance to the Osiris and Isis of the Egyptians: So great, that I have not the least doubt of their being such Dæmons as the Egyptian; for I think it is impossible to account, how such a man or woman should have appeared in Peru at so early a period as the eighth or ninth century, and introduced ci-

vility and arts among the savages there. They could not, I think, have come from any part of North or South America, which we must suppose to have been then much more barbarous than it is now. And it is impossible to suppose that they should have crossed the Atlantic, and have come from Europe. I am, therefore, of opinion, as I have said, that they were genii or Dæmons, sent down from heaven to civilise those barbarians, and thus far enable them to recover from their fallen state.

Nor, I think, is the testimony of our scripture wanting to support my opinion: We read there of angels, and likewise of archangels, who certainly were an order of beings superior to the angels. We may therefore, I think, suppose them to be altogether immaterial beings: Whereas the angels may have been Dæmons that were embodied. That this was the case of those angels, who came to visit Abraham, is evident; for they not only had the bodies of men, but ate and drank with Abraham*. And that angels had a superintendency and direction of human affairs, Plato and Hesiod suppose. With them too our scripture agrees; for we read, in the Revelation, of the angels of different churches: And in Daniels vision, he says, he saw the angel of the Kingdom of Persia, whom he calls the Prince of Persia, but plainly distinguishes him from the Kings of Persia, and the other Kings whom he mentions in that vision†; and also the Prince of the Greeks, whom I understand likewise to be the angel of the Greeks‡. And he also mentions the angel Michael, as *the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people*, that is, for the children of Israel§. And there is a very remarkable passage in Deuteronomy||, which says, *When the most high divided the nations,*
and

* Genesis, chap. 18.

† Daniel, chap. 11. v. 2. and following.

‡ Ibid. chap. 10. v. 13. & 20.

§ Ibid. chap. 12. v. 1.

|| Deut. chap. 33. v. 8.

and scattered the sons of Adam, he set bounds to the nations according to the number of the Angels of God*. And for this Moses desires the people of Israel to enquire at their fathers and their elders, and they will tell them so†. So that it appears to have been a constant tradition among the Israelites from the earliest times. It therefore appears, that every nation had its guardian angel; and I think we may reasonably suppose, that these angels, being in rank inferior to the arch-angels, were Dæmons, though perhaps superior to the Egyptian Dæmons, having bodies of a finer texture; and, if not immortal, living longer than the Egyptian Dæmons did, though these lived very long, some of them of the first race, it is said, 2000 years, as I remember.

But if there were any doubt of there having been in antient times Dæmons, on the earth, of the human form, there is a passage in the sixth chapter of Genesis, which, in my apprehension, puts the matter out of all doubt. It is in the 2d verse, where it says, *That the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose.* And in the 4th verse we have these words: *There were giants in the earth in those days: And also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them; the same became mighty men, which*

X 2

were,

* The words of the text are, 'עַתָּה דִּמְיָהֲלִי אֶת הָאָרֶץ לְעַמִּי אֲנִי וְאֵלֶיךָ אֶתְּנֶנָּה. Which are thus translated in our Bible, *When the most high divided to the nations their inheritances, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel.* This is one of the most blundering translations in our Bible; for it gives a meaning to the passage quite different from the true one; which undoubtedly is, that God divided the nations according to the number of the angels, assigning to each a nation as his particular province. I have elsewhere observed (Vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 84.) another blundering translation of a passage in Exodus, (chap. 3.) where our translators make nonsense of a very sublime Theological truth.

† Verse 7.

were, of old, men of renown. And the passage is rightly translated according to the Septuagint, and also according to the Hebrew, if we can trust to the translation by Calmet, published at Venice in 1754. Now these *sons of God*, as they are called, who copulated with the daughters of men, must have been Dæmons, that is an order of beings above men, but embodied as men are; and if so, it was very natural that the children should be much superior to other men, and such as the Greek *heroes*, or ἡμιθεῶν γένος ἀνδρῶν, as Homer calls them; being a mixture of women with a superior race of beings.

From the commentary of the translator above mentioned, it is evident that this was the opinion of the elder fathers of the church, such as Lactantius, Origen, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian and Ambrosius. At the same time he informs us, that the later fathers were of opinion, that, by the *sons of God* here, were meant the children of Seth, and that the daughters of men were the children of Cain. And the reason they gave for their opinion was, that these *sons of God* were angels, or spirits entirely separated from body, so that they could not mix with women. But this is plainly begging the question; and supposing that they were not *Dæmons*, that is spirits embodied, but pure immaterial substances. Neither, do I think, can any good reason be given, nor indeed any reason at all, why the daughters of Cain should have been so much handsomer than the daughters of Seth; so that the sons of Seth should have fallen in love with them rather than with the daughters of their own family and tribe.

And thus, I think, it is proved that Dæmons, such as the Egyptian, existed in other nations, in very antient times.

As these Dæmons had been Kings of the country, and had introduced civility and invented arts, it was very natural that they should be

be the objects of the popular worship. At the same time, I think it is evident, that the learned among the Egyptians, I mean the Priests, distinguished betwixt the religion of the people and the religion of philosophers: For I think it is certain, that the Priests not only believed in the existence of one supreme being, but they knew how all things proceed from him, and in what order; first, the principle of *intelligence*, by which all things were made; and, secondly, the principle of *life and animation*, without which the whole creation would have been a lifeless mass: In short, they knew the mystery of the Trinity, which I hold to be a truth of Philosophy, and of the highest part of philosophy, theology, as well as of revelation; a truth, which was discovered by such philosophers as the Egyptian Priests, but could not have been known to the apostles and first Christians, without revelation. This Theology Plato brought with him from Egypt; for that Plato knew this mystery of the Trinity, but kept it a mystery, *ἡ μυστηριώδης*, as he expressed it, there is no doubt*; and for that reason, his Theology is said, by the fathers of the church, to agree so much with the Christian†. Now he could have learned this Theology no where else but in Egypt. He certainly could not learn it in Greece, as among the Greek philosophers before his time, and even after his time, down to the time when Alexandria became the seat of philosophy, there is not the least hint given of it. And as to the notion, of Plato having learned it from some Jews that he met with in Egypt or elsewhere, in the first place, there is no evidence that Plato or any other Greek philosopher went among the Jews to learn philosophy; and secondly, if he had gone to Jerusalem to converse with the Jews there, he could not have learned it from them, as it is certainly not revealed in the books of the Old Testament, nor was it known to Jew or Christian till the coming of our Saviour.

As

* Vol. I. of Origin of Lang. p. 7. 2d edition, and vol. V. of the same work, p. 338.

† Vol. V. of Origin of Lang. p. 344. and 345.

As to the popular religion of Egypt, it was full of rites, and ceremonies, and of pomps, and processions, which were wonderfully attended by the people: And Herodotus mentions one procession to the city of Bouhastis, in honour of Diana, in which there were 700,000 men and women besides children^{*}; for it is by their senses, and not by their understanding, that the vulgar must be captivated, and their attention fixed on any thing: So that temples and altars, pomps and processions, and ceremonies of every kind, are necessary for the popular religion of every country. Accordingly there was of these a great deal in the Greek and Roman, as well as the Egyptian religion. The Jewish religion, besides a great many rites and ceremonies, was a religion of more splendour and finery, than any of those I have mentioned. Among them Solomon's temple exceeded any thing, of the kind, to be seen in the other countries I have named. Even when they were in the wilderness, they made a Tabernacle, an Ark, an Altar, and a Mercy Seat, of wonderful finery and sumptuousness. The Mercy Seat and the two Cherubims were of pure gold, the Ark was overlaid with gold, outside and inside †. The Altar was likewise overlaid with gold ‡. And not only were the materials so costly, but the art, with which they were wrought, we must suppose to have been perfect of the kind; for the artists were inspired §: And there was a magnificence and a finery in the dress of the Jewish Priests, such as is not to be found in any other antient nation, particularly in the dress of Aaron the high Priest, which, besides gold, purple, scarlet, and fine linen, had, upon the breast-plate, twelve precious stones of different kinds, in four rows.

Such grandeur and magnificence could not fail to excite the attention of a people, who were as much or more governed by their senses,

* Lib. 2. chap. 60.

† Exodus, chap. 25.

‡ Ibid. chap. 30.

§ Ibid. chap. 31.

ses, than any people we read of. Even after their miraculous deliverance from Egypt, by the plagues sent by God among the Egyptians, and the dividing the Red Sea to give them a passage through it, I doubt whether they would have believed in God, if he had not conducted them through the Wilderness by a cloud in the day and a fire in the night; and if they had not, from the top of mount Sinai, not only seen him but heard him: So that he was perceived by two of their senses. And when this intercourse with divinity had ceased for a few days, (not more than 40), they desired to have a corporeal God, whom they might worship: And this was the figure of Apis, whom they had seen so much adored in Egypt*. And it would seem that God thought it necessary, in order to confirm the faith of even Moses, to show himself to him under a bodily form †.—Even after they were settled in the land of Canaan, they had so many sacrifices, religious rites, and ceremonies, that they still kept up a communication with the divinity by their senses. And as to the Egyptians, besides sacrifices and processions, they had so many living symbols of divinity, with which they were daily conversant, and of which I shall presently speak, that they might be said to live with their Gods. And they were so fond of that life, and so much occupied by it, that when they were debarred it, and their temples shut up and sacrifices forbid, which was the case under Cheops, the King who built the pyramid, they reckoned themselves miserable ‡. It is true that they were employed by Cheops in building his pyramid, which to be sure was a great labour. But they would have been still more miserable if they had had nothing to do; for they would not have known how to have spent the time, which they were in use to spend in their devotion.

Music was an essential part of the religion of the antient world: Nor indeed is there any thing perceived by our senses, that affects the sentiments

* Exodus, chap. 32.

† Ibid. chap. 33.

‡ Herodotus, lib. 2. chap. 124

sentiments and dispositions of our minds more. And particularly it may be so composed, as to inspire devotion more perhaps than any thing else. And accordingly it was by their church music, chiefly, as I have elsewhere observed*, that the Jesuits converted the barbarians of Paraguay. Nor was the Religion of Egypt wanting in this respect; for their processions were accompanied by music†, and Plato tells us, that they had several songs of Isis, that were 10,000 years old. And they considered music as so essential, both to the religion and the good government of the country, that they would suffer no innovations to be made in it, nor any other music to be practiced but that which had descended to them from the age of their Gods‡.

The Egyptians, besides the intercourse they had with their Gods, by sacrifices, processions, and many rites and ceremonies, had a more direct and immediate communication with them by the means of their oracles, which they consulted, not only in their public affairs, but in matters of private concern, such as disputes between man and man. And the responses of their oracles were not mysterious and ambiguous, as among the Greeks, but plain and direct, as far as I can collect from Herodotus. The Egyptians sought to be informed of future events in no other way. But the Greeks, besides their oracles, which, like many other things, they got from Egypt, (as is evident from the account, which Herodotus gives us, of their most antient oracle, that of Dodona§,) divined by the entrails of the beasts they sacrificed. As to the Romans, they had no oracle worth mentioning, and none that they consulted in their public affairs. But they divined not only by the entrails of beasts, but by the flights of birds, and even by the feeding of chickens, which they called sacred, and kept for that purpose.

* Page 101. of this volume.

† Herodotus, Lib. 2. cap. 60.

‡ Plato De Legibus, lib. 2. p. 656. and 657. Edit. Serrani.

§ Herodotus, Lib. 2. cap. 52.—54. et Sequen.

The

The antient Christians, and even the most learned among them, such as Eusebius and Origen, believed that the antient oracles proceeded from Dæmons, and were not mere priestcraft and imposture; but that they had ceased upon the coming of our Saviour*. That the Egyptian oracles were the predictions of Dæmons, to whom it was permitted to reveal future events, I have no doubt; and that they were given by the spirits of some of those Dæmons, who had reigned over them. Of these Herodotus has given us a catalogue; they were Hercules, Apollo and Minerva, Diana, Mars, Jupiter and Latona†. But I make a distinction betwixt the oracles of the Egyptians and those of the Greeks, as well as betwixt their Gods. The Gods of the Greeks were men, and born of men, as Herodotus has very plainly told us‡: For they were men who had either come from Crete, (originally I am persuaded from Egypt), or were born in Greece, to whom the Greeks gave the names and titles of Egyptian Gods, and ascribed to them the attributes and adventures of these Gods; whereas I think I have proved, that the Egyptian Gods were Dæmons, that is Beings superior to men. And if that be admitted,

* See upon this subject a very pretty little work of Fontenelle, entitled, *Histoire de Oracles*.

† Lib. 2. chap. 83.

‡ Lib. 1. cap. 131. The expression he uses is *ἀνθρώπων*, an epithet he never applies to the Egyptian Gods, whom it is evident he thought to be Gods, or at least beings very much above men: And accordingly he every where mentions them with reverence, and observes a religious silence with respect to their actions and sufferings: *Ταῦτα μὴ εὐνοῖαν αἰεὶ*, is his common expression upon that occasion. It appears that he was desirous to conceal even that they were mortal beings: And accordingly he does not mention the places where they were buried, though it is evident that he knew them. The Egyptians, he tells us, had what they called *ἱερόα*, the name they gave to their *mysteries*, in which were represented the actions and sufferings of their Gods. (Lib. 2. cap. 171.) In these I am persuaded Herodotus was initiated, under the vow no doubt of secrecy, which made him observe that religious silence with respect to these Gods.

mitted, I think there can be little doubt, that the oracles, ascribed to them, did truly proceed from them. But as the Greeks had no Gods, such as those of the Egyptians, neither had they any Dæmons, who uttered oracles to them. Their oracles, therefore, we cannot suppose to have proceeded from any supernatural power, but from mere men, some of them, I think, of very superior understanding. Such was the oracle that was given to the Athenians, when they consulted the Delphic God what they should do, when they were attacked by that prodigious army of Persians commanded by their King Xerxes. The advice they got was, *to trust to their wooden walls*; given, like most of the oracles, in ambiguous terms; and which accordingly was misunderstood by some of the Athenians, who thought it applied to some wooden walls of their Citadel; but being rightly interpreted by Themistocles, to mean their *ships*, it saved Greece, and, I think, I may add, all the arts and sciences that we have got from Greece, which I believe would have been lost if Xerxes had then conquered that country. At the same time, I am of opinion, that there was a good deal of priestcraft and imposture in those Greek oracles, particularly in later times, many of which were detected about the time of our Saviour's coming, and which I believe was the true cause of their ceasing at that time*. But with respect to the Egyptian oracles, there is not the least evidence of any imposture in them, though it may be true, that all their responses might not be exactly true; for the Dæmons were not infallible: Nor does it appear, that those, who had the direction and superintendence of those oracles, had any interest to falsify them, such as the Priests of Delphi, and of other oracles in Greece, had, who were generally very well paid for their responses.

With respect, therefore, to the Egyptian oracles, a material part of their religion, by which they were directed in the conduct of their public

§ See Fontonelle's work before quoted.

public and private affairs, there was nothing impious or absurd, nor any ground to suspect fraud or imposture.

The only other thing I shall mention, concerning the Egyptian religion, is what is peculiar to it, and not to be found I believe in the religion of any other nation, antient or modern; I mean their *sacred animals*, that is animals consecrated to certain divinities, maintained when alive with great care and attention and at considerable expence, and when dead buried with much pomp and ceremony in sacred ground. This is thought by many to be such an absurd impiety, as to disgrace both the religion and the sense of the nation. But Plutarch has informed us *, that these animals were consecrated as symbols or emblems of the attributes of the divinity; and he says, what I think is very true, that any thing of the animal life, or even of the vegetable, is a much better type of divinity than mere inanimate matter, such as statues of marble or brass, by which the Greeks used to represent their Gods. But I think, and so does Plutarch, that it is most absurd to suppose that the wise men of Egypt, or even the sensible among the vulgar, believed that these animals were real divinities. If that had been the case, our Bible would not have told us that *Moses* was instructed in all *the wisdom of the Egyptians*. By the means of these animals, the Egyptians may be said to have lived more with their Gods, than any other nation that we hear of, having, before their eyes, symbols of their divinities, not only in animals, which they could see but rarely, such as that sacred bird the *Ibis*, who destroyed serpents, and was therefore thought a very fit emblem of divinity, but common animals, such as dogs and cats.

And thus, I think, is proved the truth of what Herodotus says, that the Egyptians were the most religious of all people. And if it be true, as I think it certainly is, that the people must be governed

Y 2

not

* De Iside et Osiride.

not by their reason, but by their senses, it is necessary, that, in the popular religion of every country, there should be a great deal of pomp and show, rites and ceremonies, such as we have seen there were in the Jewish religion, and that of the other countries I have mentioned. Among the Egyptians, their sacred animals were so many memorials of their Gods constantly before their eyes: So that there was among them more of *present deity* than in any other nation. It is therefore not to be wondered, that they were the most religious of all nations. And as no people can be happy or well governed without religion, they were for that reason the happiest people, I believe, that ever existed, and the best governed, for the longest tract of time, of any nation that we hear of.

And here we may observe the difference betwixt the religion of the philosopher, and that of the common man; the philosopher, having cultivated and improved, by the study of science and philosophy, that *particle of divinity* which is in him, forms the ideas of immaterial substances, and of intelligence unembodied; and at last attains to the idea of a supreme intelligence governing this universe, and of numbers of other intelligences under him. And thus he may be said to live in the world of spirits, being separated from body as much as he can be in this life. While the vulgar mind, immersed in body, is only conversant with objects material, knowing nothing of superior intelligences, and not even of his own, never having studied it. Far less can he know any thing of the supreme intelligence, unless by signs and symbols, rites and ceremonies, and other things perceived by his senses. But even this *sensual* religion, as it may be called, if it be well conducted by the rulers of the state, will make a great impression upon him, and inspire him with religious sentiments, which must have a great effect upon his manners and conduct in this life, and will prepare him also for a better life in the next world. But a religion of *contemplation*, such as that of the philosopher, is not fit for an uninstruited mind, being, in such a mind, apt to run into fanaticism and wild enthusiasm.

CHAP.

C H A P. VIII.

Of Government, and the general Principles upon which it must be founded.—Of the importance of Government,—without it there could have been no arts or sciences among men; nor of consequence any Religion.—Even Religion without Government could not have made men happy.—Therefore Government a most important part of the history of man.—Men first lived in herds,—then in families.—Examples of men living in that way in antient times, and even at this day.—Of the Union of families, States were formed.—There Government became necessary.—Every State must consist of the Governors and the Governed.—It is Nature that must fit men to govern or to be governed.—The Greek Philosophers have said too little of nature, and seem to have supposed that education in the matter of Government was every thing:—Of the difference of men by nature,—some fit to govern, and some fit to be governed.—Of Hesiod's division of men:—The first class of that division only fit to be governors.—These must be very few in every nation.—The excellency of the species, Man, confined to a few races, like that of other specieses.—The two other classes of men fit only to be governed, but in different ways.—No education can make men fit to govern, who by nature are not qualified.—How it was first discovered that men by nature were so qualified:—It was by the look, the figure, and the size.—In this way men were distinguished in the herds;—and still more in the societies formed of families,—of these were the first founders of States and Rulers.—This proved by the example of the first States of Greece.—No States could have been constituted without such men.—The description of such men by Homer.—

Of

Of the heroic Kings in Greece.—These not Demons, like the first Egyptian Kings, but mere men that came from Crete or Egypt.—Of the heroic form of Government,—of the qualifications necessary for the governor of such a state.—The same form of Government among the Indians of North America.—Observations upon the necessity of eloquence for carrying on a free Government.—The antient heroic Kings excelled in that art.—The account of these Kings given by Homer, an important part in the history of man.—They were the noblest race of men that ever existed.—No exaggeration by Homer in their characters and manners;—all those heroes of noble birth.—The value of horses depends upon their birth.—No distinction betwixt men and horses in that respect.—In later times, the distinction of birth observed, particularly among the Athenians and the Romans.—The bad consequences of the neglect of that distinction, particularly among the Romans.—The same distinction of birth observed in modern times, particularly in the Knights of Malta.—No distinction of races of men now, as there was in the heroic times.—Of the degeneracy of the best races of men by impure mixtures, and by an improper education and manner of life.—Example of one heroic race being preserved by living in a proper way.—The Government in Rome under the Kings, the same with the heroical Government.—Better under one King than two Consuls.—Of the defect of the heroic Governments in giving so much power to the people.—The consequence of that in Athens and in Rome.—Another objection to this heroical Government is, that it was not fitted for the improvement of arts and sciences.—These defects remedied in the Government of Egypt.

IN the preceding chapter I have spoken at great length of the Religion of the Egyptians. I am now to speak of their Government; and I hope to be able to show, that they were not only a most religious people, but the best governed, that we have ever heard of.

of. But, before I come to treat of their government in particular, I will say something of government in general, and explain the principles upon which I think all good government must be founded.

It is government that constitutes civil society, and makes man, of a solitary and gregarious animal, a *Political* animal; and so enables him to invent and cultivate sciences, by which only he can in this life make any progress in recovering from his fallen estate. Without the use of arts and sciences to a certain degree, I have shown both from reason and facts that men could not have had even the idea of a God, nor indeed of any intellectual being*: For it is only by the study of ourselves, and of our own minds, of which men in the mere natural state, or in the first ages of society, have not the capacity, that we can know what intelligence is. But if we could suppose that men without arts or sciences might be religious, even religion without government could not make men happy; for it is government that must guide and direct the exercises of religion, which, if not properly guided and directed, may produce, and often have produced, great mischief in a nation. Government, therefore, is of absolute necessity in the civilised life; and a good system of government is the greatest discovery of science and philosophy, as well as the most useful, that ever was made by man. And I think I shall be able to show, that it was first discovered in Egypt. This I may be said to have proved already, as I have shown that so many arts and sciences were invented in Egypt, which could not have been without a regular form of polity; and one particularly calculated for the invention and cultivation of arts and sciences. As government is a most important part of the history of man, I will here explain the nature of it, and give some account of the first governments among men, and of the progress of them from one state to another.

* See Chap. VI. of this book.

That

That men, before they were civilised, lived in herds, and copulated promiscuously like cattle, I think I have proved by facts both anti-ent and modern, that can not be controverted *. And I think from reason and principles, setting aside facts, it is evident that an animal, who had not yet the *use*, but only the *capacity*, of intellect, should live in the natural way in which all animals live that are not beasts of prey. But this life must have produced much disorder among animals of so many passions and appetites as men. It was therefore very natural, that some should separate from the herd, taking with them one or more females and their children. And thus was constituted the family society, in which I believe men lived for several ages before civil society was constituted. In this way the families of Abraham and Lot lived in the plains of Asia. In the same way Homer tells us, that the Cyclops lived in Sicily, every man, as he says, governing his own wife and children: And in the same way the people of Chili live at this day †; and likewise a people at a very great distance from them, the Samoeids ‡.

That detached families should, for the purpose of carrying on any joint work, and of providing for the necessaries of life, or from some other motive of convenience, unite together and form a little state, must I think in process of time necessarily have happened; and, as Charlevoix tells us, did actually happen in North America, where the first states, he says, were formed by the Union of three families. More families would naturally join the few that had first associated, and for the same reasons: And thus at last a great number of families would be associated, which would make a regular polity, and form

* Vol. I. of Origin of Language, Book 2. chap. 3.

† Frezier, in his account of South America.

‡ This fact I have learned from a book, of which I got the use from the King's Library in London, entitled, 'Memoire sur les Samoeides et Lapons,' written by a Prussian, who was in exile for some years at Archangel.

form of government of absolute necessity. And thus did Government first begin, of which I am now to explain the nature.

In all governments there must necessarily be two orders of men, the *governors* and the *governed*; which must be distinguished from one another. And the first thing to be considered is, who are by nature fit to govern; and who on the other hand are only fit to be governed: I say *by nature*; for nature must take the lead in all the arts of life, and as much or more, I think, in the great art of government, than in any other. And I think the Greek philosophers, in what they have written upon government, have said much too little of nature, but so much of education, as one should believe they thought that education alone could fit men to be good governors or good subjects. But though I hold it to be absolutely necessary for both these purposes, nature must do her part, and lay the foundation, without which the best education can avail but little.

That men are different by nature, as well as by education, I think it is impossible to deny. We must therefore begin this inquiry, by considering the nature of *man*, and try to discover of what kind those men are, that by nature are destined to govern or to be governed. And here an antient Greek poet, I mean Hesiod, has given us a division of men, the best, I think, that ever was made with respect to government. Some men, says he, are capable of giving good advice; others, though they cannot give good advice, will take it: But there is a third kind, who neither can give good advice, nor will take it when given by others; and these, says he, are useless men*.

VOL. IV.

Z

That

* Hesiod's words are,

Ὅσους μὲν παῖδες ἴσους, ὅς μιν ἄνθρωποι
φρονέουσιν τε καὶ ἐκείνῃ καὶ ὅς τινος ἄλλου ἀλλοτρίῃ.

Εὐδαίμων

That there is a difference of natural parts among men, and that all men by nature are not fit for all things (for, *non omnia possumus omnes*, as the poet says,) is what I think undeniable. And it is equally certain, that of the first and superior class of men, mentioned by Hesiod, the governors are by God and nature destined to be. These must in all countries be very few in number; for it is with men as with other animals, the excellency of the species is confined to a few individuals, and their race. And if it were otherwise, man would be an exception to a rule, which we find to hold universally, among the animals that we are best acquainted with, and whose nature we have studied, such as horses, oxen, and dogs. The second class of men is more numerous; and these are the men who are capable of being governed as free men, that is, not by terror or compulsion, but by persuasion, being able to judge of what is right or wrong when it is set before them. But the third class is the most numerous of all in every nation; and they must be governed by fear and dread of punishment, that is like slaves; and as they are so numerous in every country, it is for this reason Aristotle has said, that a great part of mankind are by nature doomed to be slaves; and that, therefore, there is nothing contrary to nature in the state of slavery*. And I will add that there is many a man, who could hardly have a worse master than himself. Thus it appears, that Hesiod's way of classing men, not only points out to us those who are fit to govern, but also those

Ἡσίοδος δ' ἄνθρωποις τρεῖς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πρὸς τὴν φύσιν
 ὅς τις ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ φύσις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοι
 ἐν τούτῳ βαλλόμενοι, ὅς τις αὐτοῦ φύσις.

Opera et Dies. v. 293. et sequen.

Homer very well describes the men of the first class, by saying that they see *en avant* and *en arriere*. Of such men the head of Janus with two faces, the one looking *before* and the other *behind*, is a very good emblem.

* *De Republica*, Lib. 1. Cap. 5. and following.

those who are fit to be governed as free men, that is, by persuasion, and also those who must be governed as slaves.

There is another thing to be observed concerning the nature of man, which, I am persuaded, Hesiod knew, though he has not told it; that the qualities of mind as well as of body descend to the race. And in this respect, too, man resembles other animals, and particularly the horse, whose blood is known by his spirit, as well as by his figure, shape, and movements.

Thus I think it is evident, that nature has laid the foundation of excellence in the great art of government, as well as in other arts; and that no education can make a man fit to govern, who is not by God and nature destined for that office: And it only remains to be inquired, how we are to discover this destination. That men by governing, will show themselves fit to govern, there is no doubt. But the question is, by what marks they were first distinguished, and allowed to govern. And I say that the character of a governing man is as easily to be discerned in the features of a man, his look, his voice, and the movements of his body, as blood is in a horse, by his look and movements: Nor do I think that there is any designation of character so marked in us, as that of a governing man. These marks that I have mentioned, joined with a superior size and figure, make what Euripides calls the *'ειδος' αἰὲν ὑπερανιδος*, or as Tacitus has very well translated it, *forma principe viro digna*.

It was in this way, that, I am persuaded, men were first distinguished among herds of savages; for that men lived in herds before they were formed into civil societies, and what may be called nations, is, as I have said*, evident, both from fact and history, and from the reason of the thing: Now I say, that, among these herds, men who

Z 2

were

* Page 176. of this Vol.

were by nature destined to govern, would be distinguished by the marks above mentioned from the rest of the herd, and followed and admired; and they would be much more so, when families joined together to form states. And if, besides their superiority of figure, they distinguished themselves in fight and in council, and invented or carried to greater perfection some of the necessary arts of life, they would become chiefs and rulers, and form nations, to which they would give their names. And this I hold to have been the origin of the first governments among the Greeks, where such men as Dorus, Æolus, Ion, and Hellen, formed the nations Dorians, Æolians, Ionians, and Hellens; and in like manner in Asia Dardanus and Tros formed the state of Troy, and gave their names to the people.

Without men so distinguished by nature, I do not think that such states, as I have mentioned, could have been constituted in Greece, nor indeed in any other country; for it is impossible to suppose that savages, who had by nature no superiority one above another, would assemble together, form a plan of polity, and chuse kings or governors: I am persuaded, therefore, that in every country, when polity first began, providence so ordered things, that men should have the assistance either of Beings superior to men, such as the Dæmons in Egypt were, (which country, as it was intended to be the parent country of all arts and sciences, appears to have been particularly favoured by heaven,) or of men much superior to other men, and who were by God and nature destined to govern their fellow creatures. And this I hold to have been the origin of all nobility, and of the *Jure Divino* right of Kings. Of such a King Homer has said,

—ὁ ἰδὼς Χροὸν καὶ ἀγκυλομενῶν

Σαυτέρου τ' ἔτι διμίστας, ὡς οἶον ἡγεσάμεν*.

And this leads me to speak of those heroic Kings of Greece, who fought at Troy, to whom Homer so properly applies these lines, and

of

* Iliad. 2. v. 205.

of the form of polity in those states, which they governed. They pretended to be something more than men,

— ἡμιθεοὶ γένος ἀνδρῶν,

as Homer calls them, being the Sons, as they said, of Gods. But the Gods of Greece, as I have observed elsewhere, were not even Dæmons, but mere mortal men, who came to Greece from Crete*, but originally, I am persuaded, from Egypt, from which Greece got its arts, and a great part of its inhabitants. The Arcadians, who were the most antient people in Greece, and called themselves προσελῆνοι, that is *more antient than the moon*, were a colony from Egypt; and so were the Athenians the first people in Greece†. And Herodotus has told us, that the leaders of the Dorians, a most antient tribe in Greece, were all from Egypt: And one of them Hercules, of whom they made a God, was originally an Egyptian, as the same author tells us, both by the father and mother.

The governments in those states of Greece, where those heroes ruled, were, I think, perfect models of what may be called a free government; for the kings there had for their council the elderly men of the state, which was what they called the βουλή γεροντων. With them the Kings deliberated: And what was determined, was reported by the King to a general assembly of the people. So that it was no law till it had their approbation; and that was obtained by the King haranguing them: So that they were persuaded before they acted. And for that reason it was necessary that the Kings should excel not only in council and in fight, as Homer says, but in eloquence. And accordingly Phoenix taught Achilles.

— μὲν δὲ τίς πρῶτος ἐμνήσθη προέταρα τίς ἔργον †

A

* Diod. Lib. 5. cap. 77.

† See what I have said upon the subject of the Athenians and Arcadians, being Egyptian colonies, in Vol. I. of Orig. of Lang. 2d. edit. p. 636. and following. And in Vol. V. p. 101.

‡ Iliad. 9. v. 443.

A very compleat plan of education described in very few words. So that the Kings in these heroic governments, were not only by their birth superior to other men, but by their education. This same heroic form of government is at this day the government among the Indians in North America; for they are governed by hereditary chiefs, and a council of their Sachems or elderly men. And what the chief and this council determine, is proposed to a general assembly of the warriors for their approbation by the chief, who harangues them, and who, therefore, like the Greek heroic Kings, must excel in eloquence, as well as in council and in fight. And accordingly it is well known, that a chief can have no dignity or authority, if he cannot speak.

And this shows the excellency of the art of eloquence, by which alone a free government can be carried on: For in private conversation men may be convinced by question and answer; in the manner of the Socratic dialogue, the most instructive of all conversation; but conversation and public speaking, are two things quite different; for, in the assembly of the people, the only method of persuasion is by haranguing, when the ears of the people must be filled and pleased, as well as their understandings informed; so that the sound in eloquence must be studied as well as the sense. And of action, which is the principal quality of an orator, the chief part is the management of the voice; joined, however, to that, there must be the look and the gesture of the body; and a certain dignity in the whole appearance of the man. Oratory, therefore, requires not only great talents of mind, but advantages of person, such as none other of the fine arts requires, so that it is the most eminent and most dignified of all arts, and I think is not improperly honoured by Cicero with the appellation of *Regina artium*. And I have no doubt but that those antient heroic Kings, who were superior men, both in mind and body, were very great orators, perhaps the greatest that

that ever existed; and, accordingly, Homer has put into their mouths, as I have elsewhere observed *, some of the finest speeches that ever were made.

The account which Homer in his Iliad has given us of those heroic governments, is a very important part of the history of man; For I do not think, that ever such men existed so eminent in council and in fight, in eloquence, public spirit, private friendship and hospitality. Whatever liberties Homer may have taken with facts, and I think there can be no doubt that he has added and taken away circumstances, and altered the order and arrangement of them, that he might give to his fable that unity and that *ideal beauty* without which no work of art can be perfect. But, as to the characters and manners, I have not the least doubt, that he has given them truly and faithfully, and at the same time minutely and circumstantially. He has described the Greek heroes, not only as very great but very amiable men. So that I do not wonder, that Horace, though he lived in what is commonly thought a very fine age, earnestly wishes to have been born in that heroic age,

— Hos utimam inter

Heroes natum tellus me prima tulisset †

There are, I know, who think that Homer has exaggerated much in this matter, and that, upon the whole, those Greek heroes were men such as we, or very little different. But if he had ascribed the actions, he makes those heroes perform, to men such as we, I should have thought the Iliad a mock heroic poem, like the *battle of frogs and mice*.

All those heroes were, as I have said, men of illustrious birth, though not Gods, nor even Demons, like the first Kings of Egypt. Nor is there any example, in those antient times, of men who

founded

* Vol. VI. of Orig. of Lan. Book 4. Chap. 1.

† Lib. 2. Sat. 2. v. 92.

founded states or performed any great action, that were not descended of noble parents. Among us at this day, no horse is esteemed that is not of a good race; and no reason can be given why there should not be *blood* in men as well as in horses and other animals*; for if it were otherwise, it would be a singularity in our species, such as cannot be presumed. Homer genealogises his heroes as accurately as we do our horses; or even as the Arabians do theirs, who record the genealogies of their noble horses as carefully as we in Scotland record the rights to our lands; and some of these genealogies are carried back 2000 years: I say their *noble* horses; for we are not to imagine that all the horses of Arabia are of equal value: For there are there, as well as among us, vulgar horses of no estimation. But not only in the heroic age was birth in such estimation, but also in later times. Among the Athenians there were the *συνταγιδαι*, that is, men of noble families, who were highly respected till the government became quite democratical: and then almost all the offices of State, all of them as far as I remember, except that of General or Admiral, were disposed of by lot among the people, without the least regard to birth, education, or fortune. Among the Romans in the first ages of their state, the men of birth made a distinct order or class of men quite different from the Plebeians or vulgar men; and they only discharged the great offices of state. And their race was kept pure

* Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis:

Est in juvenis, est in equis patrum

Virtus; nec imbellem feroces

Progenerant aquilæ columbam.

Horat. Lib. 4. Od. 4.

By which it would seem, Horace thought that there was as great, or nearly as great, a difference betwixt races of the same species, as betwixt different specieses of animals of the same genus. To this authority from Horace, may be added the authority of Aristotle, who has defined *nobility* to be *ἀριστεία τοῦ σώματος*: And indeed the very name given it in Greek of *εὐγενία* implies that. It is, therefore, evident that Aristotle, as well as Horace, thought that nobility was not a thing merely of *institution*, as some people now-a-days believe it to be, but that it had a foundation in *nature*.

pure, and unmixed with the Plebeians: Betwixt whom and the Patricians, intermarriages were prohibited by the laws of the XII. Tables; and the repealing of that law, and admitting the Plebeians to the great offices of State, such as that of Consul or Dictator, was, in my opinion, one of the chief causes of the ruin of their State. The first Plebeian Consul was taken prisoner, he and his army, by the enemy; and another Plebeian Consul, Terentius Varro, lost the battle of *Cannæ*, which brought the Romans to the brink of ruin*.

In modern times, birth was also much respected, particularly in the military orders of knighthood, such as the order of Malta, into which no man at this day can be admitted, who cannot prove his noble descent for six generations on both sides. And the practice of any mean trade, or money making art, does even, in these days, degrade a man of the highest birth so much, that he cannot be a Knight of Malta, though ever so nobly born.

But I do not think that, in the degenerate state of man in modern times, there ever was such nobility, even among our Kings, as that of those antient heroic Kings, or of the Kings of Sparta in later times, who were descended of Hercules. They were truly *jure Divino* Kings, destined by God and nature to govern their fellow creatures, such as Homer has mentioned in the passage above quoted. But the best blood may be corrupted by impure mixtures, which must happen very frequently, in countries where money is so much valued as it is at present in all the nations of Europe†; or it may be debased by the education of the youth in vicious pleasures, or

VOL. IV.

A a

in

* See upon this subject, Vol. V. of the Orig. of Lang. p. 199. and following.

† There is an old Greek poet who says, that *πλοῦτος ἡμῶν γένος*: Which shows that even in antient times those impure mixtures, for the sake of money, were known.

in sloth and indolence, without these manly exercises, of emulation and contention, practised by the Greeks, which, as Aristotle has observed, give vigour to the mind as well as strength to the body. It was such an education under the discipline of Lycurgus, which preserved so long that heroic race of Kings in Sparta, the last of whom died gloriously in battle, as Diodorus Siculus informs us.

The form of government of Rome, under the Kings, was the same, or nearly the same, as the heroic government: For it was a government by a King and a Senate, or *βουλὴ γερόντων*, with the concurrence and approbation of the people, assembled, and persuaded of the justice and expediency of the measure by the speeches of the leading men: And I hold, that the government under one King was much better than the government under two Consuls: For, however government may be divided in the ordinary management of affairs, and in times of peace and tranquillity, in all extraordinary emergencies, when the safety of the state is in danger, recourse must be had to the government of one man; which undoubtedly is the best of all governments, when that man is what he ought to be. And accordingly the Roman commonwealth was not nine years old, before they were obliged to have recourse to a Dictator*.

The heroic government, with all the advantages it had, was liable to one defect, in common with all government in which the people have any share. And that was faction and opposition to the government of the best men. This evil is very little felt while the people continue virtuous. But, when they become degenerate and corrupt, it produces a great deal of mischief. Even as early as the time of the Trojan war, while the Greeks were yet a virtuous people, there was a Demagogue among them, called Thersites, whose delight it was to rail at the ruling men, such as Agamemnon and Ulysses, from envy no doubt of their superior merit, and because he thought, and

* Eutrop. Lib. 1. Cap. 12.

and I am persuaded he was not mistaken, that he was despised by them. This Demagogue was treated by Ulysses, as he deserved to be; that is he was beaten by him; and there are many Demagogues, in modern times, who deserve to be no better used. But in latter times, when the people were corrupted by wealth and luxury, the number of them increased prodigiously. And when the people came to have the whole power of the state in their hands, which was the case of Athens in later times, those Demagogues flattered the people, and made them do some as bad things as ever tyrants were persuaded to do by their courtiers. And in Rome, when the government there became democratical, the state was rent to pieces by factions, proscriptions, and civil wars, and at last ended, as Democracies commonly do, in a most violent tyranny.

But another very capital defect in these heroic governments, was, that no arts or sciences of any value could be invented or cultivated in them. So that however good the government might be, while the people remained virtuous, it was only fit for a people practising arms and agriculture, and other necessary arts of life, which was the case of the people of Greece at the time of the Trojan war, and of the Romans in the early ages of their state. But the chief end of the political life, is to improve the human intellect by arts and sciences, and so carry men on in that progress, which by God and nature they are destined to go through, in order to recover that state of bliss from which they had fallen.

That these defects were remedied in the Egyptian government, I will show in the sequel. But, before I come to speak of that government, I think it will be proper to make some observations more upon government in general; for as it is by government that man is made a political animal, and so is enabled to go on in that progress, which God and nature have destined he should make in this life, it is a matter of the greatest importance in the history of man.

C H A P. IX.

The question to be considered is, which is the best form of government among men.—That the democratical is the worst, the author supposes in the preceding chapter.—That it is so, proved a priori, from the nature of man and of government:—Proved also by fact and experience,—particularly by the example of the Athenians, a people, the cleverest that perhaps ever existed; yet they could not govern themselves.—When they ceased to be governed by the laws which Solon gave them, or by eminent men, that got the lead among them, their affairs went into the greatest disorder, and their State was ruined.—Their seizing the public money, and applying it to their maintainance and pleasures, one of the chief causes of their ruin.—This made them live an indolent and pleasurable life, which made them unfit for the great wars, wherein they engaged—of their losses in the Peloponesian war,—which had like to have ended in the total destruction of their city.—By the peace which they were forced to make, they were subjected to thirty tyrants.—One chief reason of their ill success in the war, was their suspicion of all the men of eminence among them,—which made them practice that extraordinary form of process called Ostracism.—Example of that in the case of Aristides.—They might perhaps have taken Syracuse, if they had not recalled Alcibiades from that expedition.—Their reason for recalling him, a most frivolous one.—The administration of their affairs at Rome in some instances accompanied with the greatest injustice,—an example of this in the condemnation and execution of fourteen of their sea commanders, who had obtained for them a signal victory.—Their democratical form of government corrupted their

their manners,—and made them a people quite different from their ancestors.—Their government a most compleat democracy, where Liberty and Equality were in the highest perfection.—No other example necessary to prove how bad a government democracy is, than the example of France before our eyes;—more folly, madness, and crimes, committed under that government by the French, than there is any example of in any other nation in the same short space of time.—Monarchy the best form of government.—It is the government of the Universe, and the first government among men—so much founded in nature, that it takes place occasionally even in constitutions of which it is no part,—as in the case of the Dictator among the Romans.—Of the perpetual Dictator in Rome, and then of their Emperors.—One essential difference betwixt the democratical and monarchical governments, that the democratical never can be a good government, but the monarchical, though not restrained by laws, may be a good government;—two chances for that, if the King be a good King, or his Minister a good Minister—The particular happiness of Britain is to have both good.—Nothing can make men desirous of a change of such a government, but the infection of the French madness;—proper means used to prevent that.

THE chief thing to be considered in government is, which of all the various forms of it that have been used by men, is the best. From what I have said in the preceding chapter, the reader will suppose that I think the democratical form is the worst: And indeed I am so much of that opinion, that I hold it to be impossible, by the nature of things, that a democracy should be a good government, or even that it should not be the worst that has been used by men. That there have been *virtuous people*, and that a good government, and good institutions with proper education may make them so, there is no reason to doubt. But that there should be a
wise

wise people, is by the nature of things impossible, unless we are to reject that division of men made by Hesiod, and maintain that all men are fit to give good council, or at least to take it when given by others. I, therefore, hold that what government is carried on by the whole people, without distinction of birth, rank, education, or fortune, whether it be carried on by every individual in person, or by deputies or delegates chosen by them, is of necessity a bad government, and the worst of all governments, in which there can be neither virtue nor wisdom. A proposition which is not only supported by theory, but by facts, and the experience of all ages.

The Athenians were certainly a most ingenious people: Nor do I believe that there ever existed a people more acute, and of better natural parts, and these too improved by the culture of arts and sciences. They were also a noble, high minded people: Nor was there ever a nation which acted so generous, and so disinterested a part as they did, when Xerxes invaded Greece with the greatest force, both by sea and land, that, I believe, was ever collected together: By which they not only saved Greece, but all those arts and sciences which we have got from the Greeks, and which are all that we now have*. But even they could not govern themselves. While they were contented with the constitution which Solon had given them, who had been in Egypt, and had no doubt studied government there, as well as other arts and sciences, they went on well enough; though the government he gave them, he said, was not the best he could have given them, but the best they would receive. And even after they had made their government quite popular, while their councils were directed by a Themistocles, a Pericles, or an Alcibiades, their affairs were prosperous, and they were the leading people in Greece. But when their counsellors

were

* See what I have further said, at considerable length, in praise of the Athenians, Vol. VI. of Orig. of Lang. Book V. Chap. 2. p. 344. and following.

were Demagogues, who flattered them as much as ever King was flattered by his courtiers, asking them frequently *what they would have, and what they should do to please them**, their affairs went into the greatest disorder, and ended at last in the ruin of their state.

One of the chief causes of their ruin, was their seizing upon the revenues of their state, which, we are told, was greater than all the revenues of the other states of Greece put together. And this money they laid out upon their living, and their pleasures, particularly the pleasure of their theatre: So that there was nothing left for defraying the public service, except, *first*, the contributions of the richer citizens, called *εισφοραι*, a very unequal and arbitrary assessment; and *secondly*, what they called *λειτουργιαι*, or public services, which were also a burthen upon the richer sort, such as the fitting out of ships of war, which was a great part of the expence of their state: And even the rich they made contribute to their pleasures, by defraying the expence of the choruses of their tragedy and comedy, which contribution they called *χορηγία* †.

By these means, the Athenians led an easy, indolent, and pleasureable life; such as made them very unfit for any great undertakings. But their vanity, flattered by their Demagogues, made them engage in the most dangerous enterprises, by which they suffered greater calamities, in a shorter time, than almost any people we read of. Of these Isocrates, in his oration, *De Pace*, has given a catalogue ‡ beginning with the loss of 300 gallies in Egypt with all their crews, in a foolish expedition they undertook to that country, in order to support the rebellion of the Egyptians against the

* Vol. VI. of Orig. of Lang. Book 5. Chap. 2. p. 366.

† See this explained at more length in Vol. VI. of the Orig. of Lang. p. 349. and following.

‡ Page 460. edit. Wolfii.

the King of Persia. In such another expedition to Cyprus, they lost 150 gallees. They carried their arms even as far as the Euxine sea, where they lost, of themselves and allies, 10,000 men; and, in the Hellespont, Lyfander destroyed 200 of their gallees: But the most extraordinary instance of their folly and *madness*, as I think it should rather be called, of this people, was their expedition against Sicily, which happened towards the end of the Peloponnesian war, a most dangerous war, which the Athenians carried on against the Lacedaemonians and all their allies in Peloponnesus, and which lasted 27 years. When they undertook this expedition to Sicily, the Lacedaemonians were in possession of a considerable part of their country, and almost at the gates of their city. Yet, even in that situation, they thought of nothing less than the conquest of Sicily, for which purpose they fitted out a very great fleet and army, with which they invested Syracuse, though they never had received the least injury from the Syracusans. But they were informed that they had a very fine territory round their city, which they proposed to divide among their citizens. In this expedition they lost no less than 300 ships of war and 40,000 men. And their loss was so compleat, that there was not a single man left to carry the news to Athens*.

After such losses, it was no wonder that they concluded so ill the Peloponnesian war, which had like to have ended in the absolute destruction of their city, and making a sheep park of Attica. This, we are told, was under deliberation among the Spartans and their allies. But instead of that, they obliged them to submit to the government of 30 tyrants, whom the Spartans named.

By such a series of bad conduct, under their democratical government, the people were reduced to want even the necessaries of life,

aa

* Diod. Lib. 13.

as Isocrates tells us in the end of his *Areopagiticus*. He there says a thing, that I should not have believed but upon the faith of a cotemporary author of such reputation, that there were citizens then in Athens, who went about asking charity from those they met in the streets, to the disgrace, as he very properly adds, of the city. Till I read that, I did not believe that any antient state was ever sunk to such a degree of misery and infamy.

One reason, among others, of such ill success in their wars, was their jealousy of all their men of eminence, and their suspicion that they aspired to the government of the state, and to put an end to their democracy. And, accordingly, Xenophon, in the accounts that he has given of their polity, tells us, that they were the declared enemies of all men of great eminence among them. And they had a form of proceeding, most extraordinary, against such men, which they called *Ostracism*; whereby, without accusation or trial, they banished them for 10 years.

In this way, as Cornelius Nepos has informed us, they treated Miltiades, who had gained for them the famous battle of Marathon, where 10,000 Athenians defeated 100,000 Persians; and which may be said to have been the prelude to all the victories the Greeks afterwards obtained over the Persians, who, till that time, were reckoned invincible; so that, even at the battle of Platææ, the Spartans dreaded them so much, that they yielded the post of honour to the Athenians, in order that *they* might encounter the Persians. And yet this Miltiades they condemned to pay a fine, that he was not able to pay: And so the deliverer of Athens and of Greece died in a jail. And what aggravated their cruelty exceedingly was, that Miltiades had never shown the least of the disposition of a tyrant, but on the contrary, the greatest humanity, courtesy, and affability, in his whole life and conduct. But, says our author,

Populus maluit cum innoxium plecti, quam se diutius esse in timore.

His son Cimon, for the same debt, was kept in prison; and could not have got out of it, if he had not sold his sister and wife, Elpinice, to a rich man, who was able to pay the debt: But she was sold with her own consent; for she had more generosity than the people of Athens, and declared that she would not suffer the son of Miltiades to die in jail, as his father had done. After he was in this manner released, he obtained for the people the most signal victories, both by sea and land. And, as they were then overburdened with their numbers, he led a colony of 10,000 of them into Thrace; and having defeated the Barbarians there, founded a great city, well known, in after times, by the name of Amphipolis. For all this he was rewarded, by the people, with the ostracism, though, as Cornelius Nepos, from whom I have taken this account of him, informs us, he was a man of the most singular benevolence and liberality that perhaps ever existed, and at the same time lived in the most splendid, as well as the most hospitable, manner. This it is likely was one thing, among others, which provoked that malignant and invidious people against him.

In the same way they treated Themistocles, another saviour of Greece; and who perhaps was the greatest man both in war and in peace, in council and in action, that they ever had. It was to his advice, to leave their city, and to betake themselves to their ships, or wooden walls, as the Oracle called them, that they and all the Greeks owed their safety, when invaded by Xerxes.

In the same way they treated not only men of great abilities, but of the greatest virtues, such as Aristides, who had such a reputation for integrity and justice in his dealings, that he was surnamed *the just*. But he too was ostracised, for no other reason, than this surname; as one, who voted for his exile, told himself. 'I do not, (says he,

' he), know the man; but I think no man is entitled to be distinguished by such an epithet'. Their expedition against Syracuse, mad as it was, might have succeeded, if they had continued Alcibiades in the command of the forces, which they sent to Sicily; but, instead of that, they recalled him to stand trial for a crime, which I think it is impossible he could have been guilty of, that of disfiguring, in one night, all the statues of Hermes, in Athens; many of which statues were copied from Alcibiades himself, who was as eminent for the beauty of his person, as for the qualities of his mind. Such a crime, I think, was more likely to have been committed by some who envied and hated Alcibiades, but who endeavoured to persuade the people that he was the author of it. I will mention only one other act of theirs, of the greatest ingratitude, more violent and unjust, than any I have hitherto mentioned, or than I believe was ever committed by any tyrant. It was condemning to death by one vote, and executing, five of their naval commanders, who had obtained for them a noble victory in the greatest sea fight that ever was between Greeks and Greeks; because they had left unburied those of the Athenians, who were lost in that battle, and had perished in the sea, when they were prevented by a violent storm from recovering their bodies, and giving them burial. Upon this Diodorus Siculus has pronounced the censure, that I think it deserved, treating the people as mad, who could inflict such a punishment upon men who not only had committed no crime, but were worthy of the highest praise and greatest honours. Diodorus says, that it was the Demagogues who incited them to this act of violence and injustice. But it would not have been in the power of the Demagogues to have done this, if they had not been possessed of that spirit of envy, jealousy, and suspicion, which made them the enemies of men, who had distinguished themselves so much by such a signal victory.

In short, their envy and jealousy of men of superior merit went so far at last, that these men could not live with them: And all their great men in later times, such as Conon, Timotheus, and Iphicrates*, would not live in the city, but chose rather to go into a kind of voluntary exile, excepting only Phocion, who lived with them indeed, but was put to death by them, without so much as being heard in his defence.

From what has been said, I think it is evident, that a democratical government is not only in itself a very bad government, in my opinion the worst government of any, but that it has an immediate and direct tendency to corrupt the manners of the people so governed. The people of Athens, till their government became altogether democratical, were a magnanimous, noble minded people, as eminent in virtue as they were in arms and arts: But, how much they were degenerated from their ancestors, when they undertook to govern themselves, Demosthenes, in more than one oration, has informed us*; and, indeed, the government was such, that it must have corrupted the best people in the world: For every citizen of Athens, without distinction of birth, rank, education, or fortune, was entitled not only to a vote in the public assemblies, but to hold any office of state, even the office of senator, and to be one of the council of 500, (which was reckoned the great pillar of their state,) and to hold every other office, with the exception only of the offices of general or admiral, who were elected by the people; but even in their election he had a vote. But as to all the other offices, they were distributed among the whole people by lot. So that in Athens, there

* Upon this occasion Cornelius Nepos makes an excellent observation: 'Est hoc commune vitium in magnis liberisque civitatibus, ut invidia gloriæ comes sit, et libenter de his detrahant quos eminere videant altius; neque animo æquo pauperes alienam opulentium intuentur fortunam'.—*In vita Chabriæ*.

† See Vol. VI. of Orig. of Lang. p. 367. and following.

there was the most perfect *Liberty* and *Equality*; two things, of which we have heard so much of late.

I think no other evidence is necessary to prove from fact and experience, as well as from theory, that the democratical form of government is the worst of all. It is a form which naturally puts an end to itself without any external violence: Nor is there any example in the history of man, of that form of government lasting for any considerable time. But we need not go back to ancient history, to seek for examples of the pernicious consequences of such a government; we have an example of it at present before our eyes, sufficient to convince every man of common sense and observation, that it is productive not only of the greatest folly and madness, but of the greatest crimes. The republic of France has not yet lasted a year, now while I am writing; and in that short time, it has produced more disorders, more folly, and madness, and also more crimes, than ever happened in any nation since the beginning of the world, in the same short space of time; the consequence of which has been the forming an union against them, of more nations in Europe, than ever were united against one nation. To deliberate how they are to defend themselves against these combined powers, they meet in an assembly, which they call the *national convention*; where, besides the conduct of the war, they have before them that most important business, the forming a constitution, and regulating the internal government of the country. But things are there conducted with so much disorder, noise, and tumult, and what may often be called *mobbing*, that there neither is, nor I believe ever was, an example of the like in any assembly met to deliberate on public business. This alone convinces me, that they are utterly incapable of carrying on any kind of government even in the most quiet times.

Having

Having thus shown what is the worst kind of government, the next thing to be considered is, which is the best. And I have as little doubt upon that point as upon the other; for I say that *monarchy* is the best form. It is the government of the universe, and it was the first government upon earth; for there is nothing more certain, than what the Roman historian, Sallust, tells us, that, *in terris id primum nomen imperii fuit* *. And Polybius has told us the same thing in his sixth book, where he has given the same account, that I have given, of the origin of the first government of Kings among men; and with both these authors Cicero, in his third book *De Legibus*, agrees. And as it was the first government among men, so it is the last; and that in which all governments have sooner or later ended. The government of one man is so much founded in nature, that even in those constitutions of which it was no part, it was used when the state was thought to be in danger. The Roman Commonwealth was not, as I have said †, nine years old before they had recourse to it, and chose a Despot under the name of a Dictator. This they did upon several particular occasions; and at last, when their government was so much corrupted, that the Commonwealth was become *a mere name, a shadow without a substance*, which was the saying not only of Julius Caesar, but of Cicero, they chose a perpetual Dictator; and were so lucky as to pitch upon the best man among them for that office. But as a great deal of the republican spirit remained among them, they murdered him, wanting to restore the republican government. Of this the consequence was no other than what might have been expected; for it ended in the total destruction of the Commonwealth, and the establishment of the despotic government of the Emperors; which under the first of them was mild and gentle

* Bell. Catalinar. Cap. 2.

† Page 186. of this Volume.

tle enough, but under his successors became a most violent tyranny, by some of them carried to an excess, of which there is hardly any other example in history. And in other states, as in Athens, while the republic subsisted, the people were only happy, as I have observed, when they resigned themselves to the government of one man.

I will conclude with observing one difference betwixt the monarchical and democratical government; and it is a most material one. The democratical government, I think I have shown, must be in all cases a bad government: Whereas, the kingly government, if the King be a good man, though altogether unrestrained by laws and what we call a *constitution*, may be a good government, and the people happy under it. This was the case of the Romans under some of their Emperors, such as Vespasian, Titus, and Marcus Aurelius. Or if the King should not be a good man himself, but have a good minister, still the people might be happy under his government. But it is the singular happiness of Great Britain at this time, that we have both a good King and a good Minister, under the controul, however, of the two Houses of Parliament; to which, I am persuaded, both submit with great cheerfulness; as I believe that there is not a man in the Island that is a greater friend to our constitution than they both are. Our government thus constituted, has been of late so administered, that, with the help of some other nations in Europe, whom we put in motion, we have delivered Europe from those enemies of God and man, whose professed design it was to put down regal government and the present constitution in every kingdom in Europe, and to introduce, in place of them, that *Ochlocracy*, (for it does not deserve the name of *democracy*,) which prevails in their own country, and has joined to the most disorderly government, impiety and contempt of all religion. By this means,

means, Britain makes the greatest figure, that it ever made, in the affairs of Europe, and in the best cause. Under such a government, and in such a situation of our affairs, what should make any British man dissatisfied with our present government, and desirous of a change not only of the minister, but of the constitution? Nothing that I can imagine except the contagion of the French madness: To prevent which, the wisdom of our administration has used very proper means, and which I hope will be successful.

CHAP.

C H A P. X.

Of the government of Egypt.—That government very antient,—as antient as the days of Joseph;—no other regular government then on earth, except in India:—But that government derived from Egypt.—All governments consist of the governors and the governed.—Of the governors in Egypt.—The government the remonarchical, which the Egyptians thought the best government.—The King in Egypt had only the executive power.—A higher class of men were his Counsellors.—To them were intrusted the religion of the country, and arts and sciences.—The excellency of every man, in every art and science, must depend upon his natural genius and his education,—of these two the first is principal.—Nature must lay the foundation of excelling in all arts.—Of the difference betwixt the philosophy of the Egyptians and that of the Greek philosophers, as to the natural distinction of men.—The Greek philosophers thought that education alone was sufficient to make a good governing man.—The Priests of Egypt were the governing men there.—The name which they gave themselves:—They were kept quite distinct from the rest of the people,—had the custody of religion, and the care of arts and sciences.—These two necessarily connected.—Without having cultivated his intellectual faculties, no man can have a just idea of supreme intelligence.—The reason for this.—Further proofs that there is a natural difference of men.—A great distinction of men in India in antient times.—This is still to be seen there.—This distinction of men every where to be found,—even in the new discovered World in the South Sea.—No doctrine more absurd than that of the natural equality of men.—The most pernicious doctrine when

applied to government.—Other classes of men in Egypt, set apart and distinguished from the rest.—And first the military class.—Some observations upon that class.—They belong to the 2d order of men mentioned by Hesiod.—The other classes consist of men who are necessary in every state, being such as provide the necessaries of life for the people.—Difference betwixt Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, as to the division of them.—To make the distinction of men among the inferior classes, a matter of great difficulty.—It was the work of the Demon Kings in Egypt, who formed the polity of Egypt.—This polity formed before the expedition of Osiris into India,—not the work of any of the human Kings.—Providence interposed to promote the progress of men towards their recovery from their fallen state, by the improvement of their intellectual faculties.—This he did among the Jews, to whom he gave a law and constitution, by his Angels and by Moses.—This he did also in Egypt, but not in so signal a manner, as among the Jews.—It was proper that a difference should be made betwixt the two nations.—Of the education in Egypt.—There the best education possible; for it was domestic,—all arts and sciences there hereditary, and continually increasing from generation to generation.—This education compared with the education among us, and the education among the Greeks and Romans.—Nature and Education never separated among the Egyptians.—Where that separation is made, the characters of men can never be perfect.—Of the manner of living of the Egyptian Priests.—This too qualified them to excell in arts and sciences.—In this likewise very different from men of science in other countries.—It was therefore necessary, that they should excell the Greeks and every other nation in arts and philosophy.—The Egyptians had not among them the arts of poetry and rhetoric.—Nor did they cultivate music so much as the Greeks did, as it was no art of pleasure among them.—Sculpture and painting practised among the Egyptians, but more cultivated among the Greeks.—The

Greek

Greek genius, particularly suited for the fine arts.—Of the election of the Kings in Egypt.—The Priests there were electors,—but had not so great power over the Kings, as the Priests of Ethiopia had, though the Egyptians were a colony of Ethiopians, and though there was a great similarity of customs and manners in the two nations.—Of the division of land in Egypt.

HAVING said so much in the preceding chapter of government in general, and of the different governments of different nations, I come now to speak of the government of Egypt.

That Egypt had very early a regular form of government, I think I have proved very clearly, as early as the days of Joseph*. Nor does it appear, that there was in any other country, at that time, a regular form of polity except in India; but which, I shall show very clearly in the sequel, came from Egypt: And this being the case, it is evident, that this great and most useful art of government was invented in Egypt, as well as the other arts I have mentioned.

In every country, where there is a regular government, there must be, as I have observed, two orders of men very different from one another, the governors and the governed. I will begin with the governors of Egypt, the most illustrious order of the two, and who, if they are not men, such as they ought to be, it is impossible that the country can be well governed. The form of the government in Egypt was monarchical, the best of all forms, as I think I have proved it to be: And that this was the opinion of the people of the country, who, as I have shown, were esteemed the wisest of all the antient nations, Herodotus tells us, when he says, that the

C c 2

Egyptians

* Page 132. of this volume.

Egyptians would never be without a King*. This King was chosen out of the military class of men among the Egyptians. But he was intrusted only with the executive part of the government. And there was a higher class of men still, who were his counsellors and who, at the same time, were trusted with the religion of the country, that most essential part of government: And to them also was intrusted the cultivation of arts and sciences.

The excellency of every man in every art and science depends upon two things, his natural genius, and his education. Of these two, I hold nature to be the first and fundamental quality: For if nature has not laid the foundation in every art, and particularly in the great art of government, no education or culture can make a man excel in it.

And here we may observe the difference betwixt the *wisdom*, or the *philosophy*, as the word ought to be translated †, of the Egyptians, which Moses learned, and the philosophy of the Greeks: For the Greek philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle, who write upon government, speak so much of the education of the governors, and so little of their nature and genius, that one should think they believed, that education alone was sufficient to make a governing man. And Plato is so far from thinking that there was any difference of natures among men, or, if there was any, that it ought to be preserved, that he makes it an essential part of his polity, that the wives and children of his citizens should be common: So that every distinction betwixt the races of men must in his system have been destroyed. In this, however, his scholar Aristotle differs from him, but

* Lib. 2. cap. 147. Ed. Westelingii.

† Acts of the Apostles chap. 7. v. 22. The Greek word is *σοφία*, which signifies *philosophy*, not what we call *wisdom*, that is prudence in the conduct of life.

but for other reasons, not that of confounding the races of men*. The opinion of the Egyptians was very different; for they made nature principal and fundamental in the art of government, as well as in other arts. For this reason they set apart and distinguished from the rest of the people, with whom they did not intermix by marriages, a race of men who were called by the Greeks *the Priests of Egypt*, because they had the charge of that principal part of government,—*religion*. But their name in the country was, as Herodotus tells us, *πρωμεις*†, which, as he interprets it, signifies *καλοςκαγαθος*, that is a man who has worth and goodness, and at the same time, a high sense of what is beautiful and becoming in sentiments and actions, without which no character can be perfect. These men, thus destined by God and nature to govern by their councils their fellow creatures, being set apart from the rest of the people, were the counsellors of the Kings, that is, they were the *wisdom* of the nation. At the same time, they had the care of religion, without which

* De Republica. Lib. 2. in initio.—I am surprised that Aristotle, in this work upon government, should give no preference to birth in the government of a state, when he has said, in his 7th Book *De Republica* cap. 13. that the goodness of men depends upon three things, *nature, custom or habit, and reason*. Now, that the parents of whom men are produced, must have a great influence upon their nature, he has told us in so many words, where he says, that nobility is *the virtue of the race*. (Ibid. Lib. 3. Cap. 13.) And as I have observed (p. 184. of this volume) the word which the Greeks have for *Nobility*, viz. *ευγενεια*, implies that. Yet in the constitution of his best government, which he calls *πολιτεια*, he makes no distinction of men according to their birth, nor gives any pre-eminence to the virtue of the race: And in his long chapter upon marriage, (Lib. 8. Cap. 16.) he says nothing about preventing the mixture of the better races of men with the worse.

† I think, it is not unlikely, that the name *Bramin*, which the Indians give to their Priests and philosophers, may be a corruption of the word *Πρωμεις*: For by changing the *π* into another labial consonant, viz. *β*, which is a change very common, the word becomes *βρωμεις*, and by leaving out the vowel *υ*, which is also not uncommon in languages that pass from one country to another, the word becomes *βρωμεις*. And La Croze, in his History of the Christianity of India, has informed us, that, in the Island of Ceylon, they are called by a name which comes still nearer to the word *Bramin*.

which no people can be well governed or happy; and to their care were likewise committed arts and sciences, without which, as I have observed in more than one place, it is impossible that man can make any considerable progress in this life towards recovering his former state, as that can only be by the improvement of his intellectual faculty, which is of the essence of man, and without which he can have no just idea of supreme intelligence, nor consequently be truly religious. For this I have given a very good reason, which is, that men in the uncivilized state, or even in the first age of civility, cannot be philosophers enough to know themselves: For as man is made after the image of God, and is the only image of him upon this earth, it is by the study of himself only that a man can have any idea of the supreme being: And, therefore, I have said, that nations in the rude state of society, which have got any idea of a God, must have got it from other nations, more advanced in civility and arts*.

In this manner was the best race of men in Egypt distinguished and separated from the rest of the people. And here, though I have said a good deal in the preceding chapter upon the natural difference of men, I will add something more upon the subject. The most antient nation at present in the world, now that the Egyptian is no more, is the Indian. There, Aristotle tells us, upon the authority of an author he calls *Scylax*, that the Princes of India were as much superior to the other men of the country, both in mind and body, as the Greeks supposed their Gods and heroes to have been to other men†: And I was informed by a man, who had been much in the inland parts of India, that at this day their Rajahs, or Princes, are handsomer, of larger size, and more dignified appearance, than the rest of the people. And the Bra- mins, being the best race of men in India, as the Egyptian Priests were the best race there, are easily distinguished from the rest of the

* Page 153. and following of this volume.

† De Republica. Lib. 7. Cap. 14.

the people by their look, their figure, and appearance. And I am persuaded, that, in Britain, and in every other part of Europe, a man of rank and family was, some hundred years ago, as readily known at first sight, as a horse of blood is now. And this natural distinction of men, appears to be known in every country on earth: For in the New World, which Captain Cook has discovered in the South Sea, the ranks of men are as much distinguished, by their size and figure, as ever they were at any time in Europe. Bouganville, the French traveller, says, that the Nobles in Ottaheite are so much distinguished in that way from the Tootoos, or lower sort of people, that he is inclined to believe them to be of a different nation. And Captain King, in the third volume of Captain Cook's last voyage*, speaking of the *Erees*, or chiefs of the Sandwich Isles, says, 'The same superiority, that is observable in the persons of *Erees* through all the other islands, is also found here. Those, whom we saw, were, without exception, perfectly well formed; whereas, the lower sort, besides their general inferiority, are subject to all the variety of make and figure that is seen in the populace of other countries. Instances of deformity are more frequent here than in any of the other islands.' Then he proceeds to mention some particular instances of deformity among them. And Mr Matra, who accompanied Captain Cook in his first voyage, and whom I have elsewhere mentioned†, as one who had looked with a discerning eye upon men, and had studied with particular attention manners and characters, assures me that the leading men in all the islands where he was, had something in their appearance, their voice, and manner, which distinguished them from the rest of the people so much, that it was observed even by the common sailors aboard the ship, who knew them immediately

* Page 126.

† In *Origin of Language*, Vol. V. p. 213.; also in the introduction to Vol. VI. p.

4. Where the man I mention, who gave me an account of the eloquence of the New Zealanders, is the same Mr Matra, now our consul at Morocco.

to be governing men. Captain King, in the passage above quoted, informs us, that the lower sort of people in the Sandwich islands, besides their inferiority in size and shape, are liable to several diseases from which the Erees are free. And, according to his account, they have no complaint but what is brought upon them by the use of that dreadful liquor, which unhappily they have discovered, and appears to be worse than even our brandy. It is called *ava*. With respect to health, it may be observed, that what Captain King says of the greater health of the men of distinction in those islands, is, I believe, true of men of birth every where, if they live as they ought to do; for I hold it to be one of the characteristics of the noble race among men, that they are healthier and longer lived, if they do not hurt themselves by an improper way of living, than the rest of the people. And this, I think, is the necessary consequence of their natural superiority in size and shape. The same I hold to be true of horses of blood, who, according to my observation, when they are properly used, are healthier and longer lived than other horses, and can even endure more ill usage. In short, I think that the *natural equality of men*, of which we have heard so much of late, is one of the most absurd doctrines that ever was maintained, contrary both to the reason of the thing, to fact, and to the general sense of mankind; and when applied to government, and made the foundation of the political system, leads to the most pernicious consequences; of which we have at present a most melancholy example before our eyes in France. If the philosophers there, who, I am persuaded, laid the foundation of all the mischief that has happened in that country, had been truly philosophers, as they call themselves, or had been learned enough to know the history of man, they would have known, not only that *equality* was not essential to government, but that, on the contrary, all government was originally founded upon the *inequality of men*, by which some men were much superior

prior to others, both in mind and body; without which it does not appear to me that any government on earth was ever formed or could have been formed.—But to return to the government of Egypt.

There not only the counsellors of state, the custodiers of religion, and the cultivators of arts and sciences, were set apart and distinguished from the rest of the people; but there were, in like manner, four other classes, professing different arts, who did not mingle with one another, but kept their races pure and unmixed. The first of these four was the military class, who came very properly next in order after the counsellors of the state, which, as it was governed by their councils, so it was protected and guarded by the arms of the military men. These I hold to belong to the second division of men mentioned by Hesiod, who, though they cannot give good advice, are willing to take it; for obedience to the orders of his officer is essential to the character of a soldier. And he ought to be convinced, that what he is ordered to do by his officers, is the best thing he could do; for otherwise he will not obey willingly, but will be governed, like the third class of men mentioned by Hesiod, by fear and dread of punishment, in the manner that slaves are governed; but which is unworthy of the noble mind of a soldier. As to the General of an army, he ought to be, with respect to military operations, of the first class of men mentioned by Hesiod, who know what is best, and therefore can give good advice.

But the Egyptian legislators did not stop here. And, indeed, it was necessary that men should be provided, who were to procure for the rest of the people the necessaries and conveniences of life. For this purpose, too, they thought that some men were better qualified than others, as well as for government and the profession of arms. And, in general, it appears, they believed not only that all

men were not fitted by nature for all things, but that every man was born more fitted for one thing than for another; which I am persuaded is the case. There were, therefore, besides the Priests and the soldiers, a third class of husbandmen, a fourth of shepherds, and a fifth of handicraftsmen. This is the division of the people of Egypt, which Diodorus Siculus has given us*.

And here a question will naturally occur, By what means such a division of men was made, by which distinct and separate classes of men were set apart for the different occupations of life? That the men destined by nature to govern their fellow creatures, might be discovered even among herds of men, by their look, their figure, and appearance, and by superior qualities of mind as well as of body, I have shown elsewhere; and that in this way the Greek heroes, and founders of states, became Kings and rulers. But how were a whole people divided and assigned to different occupations, for which they were by nature suited? A man, who by nature is destined

* Herodotus has made the number of classes greater, altogether seven; namely, Priests, Soldiers, Cattle herds, Swine herds, Merchants, Interpreters, and Pilots: (Lib. 2. Cap. 164.) As Herodotus was in the country much earlier than Diodorus, and when we must suppose that the ancient constitution of Egypt was better preserved than in later times, I should be inclined to think, that his division was more accurate than that of Diodorus. But I cannot account for Herodotus omitting the husbandmen, or tillers of the ground; who are the most useful of all the inferior orders of men, and, therefore, are very properly ranked by Diodorus next the fighting men. Neither can I account for Herodotus omitting altogether those who practised mechanic arts. If there were any doubt in this matter, I think it is removed by the practice of India, to which the division of men, into different classes, or *casts*, as the Indians call them, was brought by the Egyptians. Now the husbandmen, or tillers of the ground, are there a cast by themselves; and the several mechanics form so many different casts. And Diodorus Siculus tells us, that in India, in his time, the farmers were a very numerous class of people, and very much respected even by nations that were at war with one another: For it was a rule among them, not to do any hurt to the farmers or their possessions.—(Diodorus, Lib. 2. Cap. 41.)

destined to be a King or governing man, may be discovered by the εἶδος αἰῶν τυραννίδος of Euripides, or by the *forma principe viro digna*, of Tacitus: But how are we to discriminate the farmer from the shepherd or from the mechanic? And I say it was the Dæmon Kings of Egypt, that made this distinction of men, and established a form of Polity altogether singular, and unknown in any other country of the world except India, to which it was carried by the Egyptians with their other arts. That this polity was established in Egypt, before the expedition of Osiris into India, I think, is evident: For we cannot believe, that he established there a polity unknown in his own country, or that he could have fitted out such an army, and carried it to so distant a part of the world, from a country that was not highly civilized, and had not a regular form of government. I hold, therefore, that as Osiris was of the last of the three races of the Egyptian Dæmon Kings, the polity of Egypt was formed by the two first races, with some additions, perhaps, that Osiris may have made to it: For that it was not formed under Menes, or any of the human Kings, is evident from all the antient authors, who speak of Egypt. Some of these Kings, we are told, made some laws for the administration of justice; but no author has given the least hint, that any of them framed a constitution of government for the country.

That the restoration of man to his primitive state, which, I think, I have shown, could only be carried on in this life by the establishment of civil society, should be the peculiar care of providence, nobody can doubt, who believes that a wise and good God exists. And the most natural way that this event could be brought about, was by sending among men superior beings in the human form, who were to teach them arts, and establish a political society among them.

That in this way there was one people instructed from Heaven, our sacred records assure us; I mean the Jews, who, after they came out of Egypt, were guided and directed in every thing by ministers sent from Heaven. These appeared to Moses in the human form, and even to the whole people, from the top of mount Sinai, in fire and smoke; and a voice was also heard from that mountain, proclaiming the law of the ten commandments. And they received also from Heaven a religion, and a form of polity, which was communicated to them by the same Moses. The necessary arts of life they had learned in Egypt. But some of the fine arts, by which the tabernacle was adorned, we are told that they learned from Heaven; for it is said, that God instructed the artificers of that tabernacle. Now, I believe, what St Paul tells us, *that God is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles*: And, therefore, I think it is reasonable to suppose, that he would send his ministers to instruct the Egyptians as well as the Jews, especially if it be true, as I think it is, that from Egypt arts and sciences were to be propagated all over the earth. And we are told that even Moses brought with him from Egypt the *wisdom*, or, as it should be called, the *philosophy* of the Egyptians*. To suppose, therefore, that the Egyptians were instructed in the supernatural way I have mentioned, is not only agreeable to what philosophy teaches us to believe was the system of Providence for the restoration of man, but to our sacred writings, which give us an example of a people being instructed in the same way, and by a more present deity than that which instructed the Egyptians. Nor is it to be wondered, that God should interpose in a more conspicuous manner in behalf of his chosen people the Jews, from whom was to come the Messiah, the Saviour of the world, by sending his Angels to instruct them, not employing Demons as he did among the Egyptians. But these were sufficient to give the Egyptians an admirable form of government,

* See p. 204. of this volume.

ment, and to instruct them in arts and sciences, which, it appears to have been the will of heaven, should be propagated all over the world from Egypt. So that we are not to wonder, that Providence interposed in behalf of Egypt by sending Dæmons among them, not Angels, to govern them.

And thus, I think, I have shown, that, as far as nature could go, the Egyptian polity was the most perfect of any that ever existed. But as education is necessary both to make good governors and good subjects, I will next inquire concerning the education in Egypt: And I think I shall be able to show, that, in this respect also, the Egyptian government was the best that ever existed. That the domestic education under a father is the best of all educations, if the father be a man who is able to instruct his child, cannot I think be doubted; for both the teacher will be more anxious to instruct his child, than we can suppose any other teacher will be, and the child will more readily receive instructions from the parent than from any other, and will get it too more constantly and frequently than he could do from any other teacher. Now, in this way, all the children of Egypt were educated; and all the several classes were instructed in their different arts and professions. In this way their wise men and philosophers were taught the several arts and sciences, which therefore may be said to have been hereditary among them, as our lands and money are among us. And, if so, I think it was necessary, that they should go on increasing from generation to generation. Now, let us compare this way of teaching arts and sciences with our school or college education, or even with the education among the Greeks and Romans, which, I think, in some respects was worse than even our education; for among them they had no public schools, except for grammar, music, and athletic exercises. But, as to sciences, and particularly as to philosophy, which contains the principles of all arts and sciences, there was no school
by

by public authority in which they were taught. It is true, that there were men among the Greeks, who were great philosophers, and were willing to communicate their discoveries to any who chose to be their hearers. But they had no encouragement from the public, nor was any man obliged to be their scholar. So that it is true what Diodorus Siculus observes, that, in Greece, it was by accident if a man happened to get a taste for philosophy, that he applied to it. And, not only were the philosophers in Egypt taught in the way I have described, but every art and profession, even the meanest and most illiberal: So that I have no doubt, that even these arts in Egypt were carried to the greatest perfection. There was one of them, which is reckoned a great curiosity among us, the hatching of chickens and other birds without the incubation of the female. This was practised in Egypt, and must have very much increased the breed of fowls.

Thus it appears, that nature in Egypt was always assisted by education; and, indeed, they ought never to be separated: Otherwise there will be nothing perfect in the characters of men. And it is the want of the union of these two, that is the great imperfection in all the governments we know, or have heard of, except the Egyptian, or Indian, which was derived from it. And this is one of the principal reasons, among others, which makes me think the Egyptian polity not only the best that ever existed, but better than any of those imaginary polities that have been devised by philosophers, such as those of Plato and Aristotle.

Having said so much of the education of the people of Egypt, it will be proper to add something concerning their manner of living, and to inquire whether that was fit to make them excel in their several arts and professions. And, first, as to their priests and philosophers, they had every thing furnished to them, which they
wanted,

wanted, by the public, out of that portion of the land which was set apart for religion. The philosophers, therefore, of Egypt were freed from all care and solicitude about money, which, as it is well known, employs the thoughts of so many men at present in Europe, and indeed I may say of every man more or less: And which, of necessity, must divert the mind, in some degree at least, even of the most studious among us, from the cultivation of arts and sciences. The diet of the Priests, as Herodotus has described it, was of the best kind; for they were allowed flesh, and also drank wine: But, we know, they used both in great moderation. Then they had the enjoyment of leisure, without which it is impossible that any man can excel in any art or science; for there was no particular office of the state which they discharged, other than that some of them attended upon the King, giving him council and direction in the management of the affairs of the nation. That men so living, and so educated, should excel in philosophy and every science to which they applied, I think was of absolute necessity, even if they had not been men of superior genius and natural parts; which, however, it is certain that they were. They must, therefore, have excelled the Greeks and every other nation of those days, in philosophy and every art and science, to which they applied. We need not wonder, therefore, that the Greeks got arts and sciences from them in the earliest times; and that in later times, when they applied to philosophy, what they had most valuable of that kind came from Egypt, as, I think, I have very clearly shown in the preface to the third volume of this work.

But, though the Egyptians appear to have cultivated every branch of science, there were some arts which they did not at all cultivate, and others that they did not cultivate near so much as the Greeks. It does not appear that they had any poetry at all: And as to rhetoric, it could not exist in a government of which the people

ple had no share. Music they studied and practised: And, I think, there is no doubt, that the Greeks learned from them to carry their tetrachord, which was their most antient music rising no higher than a fourth, up to the octave, and so to compleat the diatonic scale. But music was not used among the Egyptians, as it was among the Greeks, for pleasure and entertainment; but was confined to the use of religion: And, therefore, no alteration or innovation was allowed in it any more than in their religion. Whereas among the Greeks it appears to have been one of their greatest pleasures, and a necessary part of another pleasure of theirs, of which the Greeks, and particularly the Athenians, were exceedingly fond; I mean theatrical representations, but of which there were none in Egypt. I am persuaded, therefore, that the Egyptian music was much more simple than the Greek; and that they used neither the chromatic scale of music, nor the enharmonic, by which the tone was divided into three and into four parts, but used only the diatonic scale. Nor had they those divisions of music into different moods, called Ionic, Phrygian, and Dorian. Sculpture and Painting were practised in Egypt; and, I am persuaded, the Greeks got those two arts from that country, as well as every other; but they improved them very much. And, in general, they appear to have been formed by nature for the cultivation and improvement of what we call the *fine arts*, that is, arts of elegant pleasure: And, accordingly, in these they excelled mankind.

As a King was a necessary part of the government of Egypt, it is proper that I should speak of the election of their Kings; a subject on which I find nothing written in any author antient or modern. That the royalty was hereditary in any family, there is no reason to believe. The King, therefore, must have been elected: And it would no doubt happen, that if the son of the preceding King was thought worthy, he would be elected; and, accordingly, there are many examples in the history of Egypt, given by Herodotus, of
Kings

Kings being succeeded by their sons. The question, therefore, is, Who were the electors? That he was not elected by any assembly of the people is evident; for there were no assemblies of the people in Egypt for any purpose whatever. Neither was there in Egypt any body of men, that might be called a senate, distinct from the Priests, that is, the counsellors of state: And if so, I think it is evident, that the Priests, or wise men of the nation, must have been the electors; and, indeed, there were no men so fit for that business. One thing is certain, that, as Plato informs us, it was necessary, that every King, before he entered upon the exercise of his office, should be admitted into the order of the Priests. This, I think, must have given them a negative in the election of every King, by whomsoever chosen. There was one of the Kings, who was himself a Priest; I mean the Priest of Vulcan. Now he could not, I think, have been elected, except by the Priests themselves.

But though I be of opinion that the King was elected by the Priests of Egypt, it does not appear that he was so much under their power, as the King of Ethiopia was under the power of the Priests there, who, if the King displeased them, might send to him, to let him know, that he was not only to resign his crown, but also his life, and to go out of the world by his own hand. At the same time, as the Egyptians were a colony of Ethiopians, as Diodorus tells us, (and I think it must have been so, as they were a black, woolly-haired, people as well as the Egyptians, and had many customs in common with the Egyptians, particularly the use of those letters, which in Egypt were called *sacred letters* and used only by the Priests, but in Ethiopia were in common use), I have very little doubt, that the Priests in Egypt, as well as those in Ethiopia, had very great power over the King, and in all matters of State. This Diodorus Siculus tells us in his first Book, chap. 73. where he says, that they lived with the King, were his assistants in

business, and his teachers and instructors; and he has given us a very particular account of their manner of living, which, he says, he took from the books of the priests *. If, therefore, it be true, as Plato has said, that it is only the government of philosophers which can make a people happy, the Egyptians certainly enjoyed that happiness, more than any people ever did.

There is one part of the Egyptian polity, of which I have not yet spoken, and with which I will conclude. It is, I think, a material part, and of very great importance. What I mean is the division of the land of Egypt among the king, the priests, and the soldiers. I have just mentioned it in a preceding part of this volume †, where I have observed, that it was the antient feudal system of Europe. I have been always a great admirer of that system; But since I discovered that it was the wisdom of the Egyptians, I admire it still more, and particularly that part of it, which constituted a landed militia. The advantages of this institution Diodorus has very well explained ‡: He says, it makes the soldiery encounter more cheerfully the dangers of war, and fight for a country, of which they have so considerable a share: 'For,' says he, 'it is 'absurd to trust the safety of a country to men, who have nothing in 'it to lose of any value: 'And, what, 'he adds, 'is of the greatest consequence, being well supplied with all the necessaries of life, they 'marry and beget children, and in that way increase the population

* Diodorus Siculus, lib. 1. cap. 69: 70. and following, where this author informs us of a thing which I think remarkable, that the King was served by no slaves, nor attended by any body, except the sons, above 20 years of age, of Priests the most eminent for their knowledge, and these sons themselves distinguished by their learning. And, upon this occasion, he makes a very sensible observation, that kings do no very bad things, unless by the ministry of those who attend them. Then he proceeds to tell us how the Kings divided the day betwixt public business, offices of religion, and study.

† Page 133.

‡ Lib. 1. cap. 73.

' of the country, so that it needs no foreign supplies of men.' Now, in this respect, let us compare the standing armies of Europe with the Egyptian military establishment or with the feudal militia, which was not very long ago in Europe. The soldiers of a standing army are little better than vagabonds, who have neither house nor home, nor any thing of value, for which it is worth their while to hazard their lives: So that it would be ridiculous to exhort them to fight *pro aris et focis*, as the antients exhorted their soldiers. And as to what Diodorus thinks of the greatest importance in the Egyptian militia, the increase of the people, there are few of our soldiers married; and of their children, I am afraid, a very bad account is got. So that the race of the strongest and ablest bodied men among us, such as the soldiers are or ought to be, may be said to be lost to the country. Now, this must have a very great effect, not only upon the numbers, but upon the size and strength of men in the country.

E e a

CHAP.

C H A P. XI.

Observations to prove that the Egyptian form of government was most perfect.—The Egyptian government had not the fault of the heroic governments, nor of the later governments in Greece, that of being too popular.—The consequence of a popular government is, giving power to men who can neither give nor take good council.—The government of Egypt had not another defect of the heroic governments in Greece, viz. that it was not fit for the cultivation of arts and sciences.—Leisure required for that, and a class of men set apart for that purpose.—This the Priests of Egypt had.—Antient learning never could have been restored in Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries, if men had not been set apart for that purpose.—Objection to the Egyptian government, that it was not a free government, such as the heroic governments.—Answer, that it was not a popular government, and so much the better for not being such;—reason for this.—Objection, that the people in Egypt were governed like slaves.—Answer, that they were so wise, as to submit willingly to the government established among them, and not to obey through fear or by compulsion.—This was the case of the Capadocians of old, and the Peasants at present in Poland and Russia.—The consequences of the People being taken from their private business to attend the Public, is their poverty.—Examples of this in Athens and Rome.—They will desire to make profit of the Public; and that will produce faction and corruption.—No Slaves in Egypt.—That proved by the silence of antient Authors upon that subject, and by the present practice in India.—Sesostris did not make Slaves of his Captives, but employed them in public works.—Slavery, an impolitical institution,—not necessary in Egypt, as it was
in

in Greece and Rome.—No indigence in Egypt, such as is in modern Nations, and was in antient times.—No money there.—Commerce carried on by exchange.—No great estates.—That prevented by the Agrarian law, dividing the land among three orders of the State.—No foreign luxury in Egypt, as they had no trade with other countries.—A singular thing in the History of Egypt, that they made no Provinces of the Countries they conquered;—nor imposed any tribute upon them.—The Egyptians, not only happy themselves, but a public blessing to mankind, by importing arts and civility among them.—The three great articles of the political system, are the health, the morals, and the numbers of the people.—As to Health, the Egyptians the healthiest of all civilised nations;—used Physic, not only to cure diseases, but to prevent them.—As to Morals—these better in Egypt than in other countries, because they were the most religious of men,—and had not those temptations to vice, which other nations have by wealth and by indigence.—Land, their only property; which could not be accumulated in the hands of individuals.—As to Numbers, these were wonderful in Egypt.—A particular account of the number of Cities under Amasis and Ptolemy Lagus.—This number of Cities more to be depended on than the numbering of Men.—Reasons given for the wonderful increase of Men in Egypt.—All marrying, and having children.—All children brought up at the smallest expense.—And children not dying under age, as so many die among us.—One extraordinary reason for the increase of people, was the addition to the country of the Delta.—This must have added very much to the numbers of the people, as well as to the increase of learning.—The Egyptian Government thus proved to be the best that ever existed; and the most fitted for the cultivation of arts and sciences.—The duration of the Government of Egypt, a proof of its excellency.—No changes made in it during a prodigious number of years.—No disputes about the succession to the Crown, till the Greeks came among

among them.—The Ethiopian Kings to be considered as of the same country.—Proof of the perfection of the Government of Egypt, is the duration of the same Government in India, notwithstanding all the conquests that have been made in that country.—People in India divided in the same manner as in Egypt.—The Hindoos of India, a very happy people.—Antient Egypt to be considered as preserved in India.—The present state of Egypt, compared with the antient, most lamentable.

IN the preceding chapter I have given the general plan of the Egyptian Constitution and Government. In this chapter, I propose to make some observations upon it, which I hope will convince the reader, if he be not already convinced, that it was the most perfect form of government that ever existed, and even more perfect than those imaginary forms, which the Greek philosophers devised, but which were never executed.

And, in the *first* place, I think I have proved very clearly, that the Egyptian polity had not that fault, which I have observed in the heroic governments of Greece, of giving the people too much power; for there it was they, who ultimately determined every thing; and in some of the states in Greece, in later times, all distinction was abolished betwixt the different ranks and orders of men, and the lowest of the people governed as much as the highest. Now the people in all countries must necessarily consist, for the greater part, of the third division of men mentioned by Hesiod, that is, of men who can neither give good counsel, nor will take it. It is, therefore, not to be wondered, that though they sometimes got good counsel from their orators, they did not take it: And it was a most sensible observation of a Scythian, who came to Greece, that the

wise

wise men among the Greeks, spoke and gave counsel, but the *fools* determined.

The other defect, which I have observed in the heroic governments, was, that they were not proper for the cultivation of arts and sciences, by which only man in this life can make any progress towards recovering from his fallen state. But there never was a government more fitted for the invention and cultivation of arts and sciences, than the government of Egypt; for there the race of the best men, they had, was set apart for that purpose, having nothing else to do, (not even to provide for themselves the necessaries of life,) except that they had the care of the religion of the country, and that some of them attended the king as his counsellors. Now I hold it to be impossible, that arts and sciences ever could have been invented or cultivated in any great degree among a people wholly employed in procuring the necessaries of life, or in the practice of arms and government, which was the case of the people of Greece in the heroic age: For there must be men set apart for that purpose, and who have leisure from the occupations of life.

If this had not been done when antient learning was revived in Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries,—if learning had not been then the public care, and if schools, colleges, and universities, had not been founded and endowed at a very considerable expence, it is to me evident, that antient learning would again have been lost; and that we should have been now as ignorant and barbarous as we were, when the Greeks imported their learning into Italy after the taking of Constantinople. This extraordinary care, therefore, that was taken to cultivate arts and sciences in Egypt, where it was made a part of the constitution of their government, is of itself, I think, sufficient to prove, that Egypt must have been the parent country of all arts and sciences, unless it could be proved, that in those early times,

times, there was any other nation who had such an order of men among them.

It may be objected to the Egyptian government, that it was not a free government, such as the heroic governments in Greece were, which I have praised so much. But the governments in Greece were popular governments, which cannot be free, unless the people be convinced before they act: Whereas the Egyptian government was not popular; and, I think, I have shewn, that it was so much the better, as it is impossible that the mere people can always be guided by the best counsel, but often by the worst, either not having understanding sufficient to perceive what is best of several things proposed, or being misguided by their passions. Of this I have shewn that the people of Athens were a striking example; the cleverest people, perhaps, that ever existed, and yet they ruined themselves by their folly and misconduct.

But it will be said, were the people of Egypt, then, governed, like slaves, by terror and compulsion; and was their only motive to obey the fear of punishment?—I say not: But as they were a very sagacious people, and I believe as wise as any people ever were, though, perhaps, not so clever as the people of Athens, they would be sensible that they were very well governed, and better than if they had been under their own government. This is only supposing that they were as wise as the Capadocians, who, when they were offered liberty by the Romans, refused it, and chose to continue under the government of their Kings. And I was informed by a Polish nobleman, (who, being descended of a Scotch family, as several of the Polish noblemen are, came to Scotland some years ago to see his relations, where I saw him), that a neighbour of his in Poland, having visited England, in the course of his travels, fell there in love with English liberty so much, that, when he returned to his own country, he called together a meeting of his
peasants,

peasants, and offered to emancipate them all, and leave them to be governed by themselves; for the peasants, both in Poland and Russia, are no better than slaves to their landlords, as they were in Britain some hundred years ago. The peasants of this nobleman thanked him for his generous offer, but said they would consider of it, and return by such a day, and give him an answer. Accordingly, they came back on the day they had appointed, and told him, that they thought themselves infinitely obliged to him for his generous offer, but that they did not chuse to accept of it, being convinced that they were happier under his government, than they would be under their own. And I was acquainted with a Russian gentleman, who told me, that the Russian peasants shew very great affection to their masters; and he mentioned a fire which happened some years ago in the opera-house of Petersburg, when it was much crowded with company, where several of the peasants lost their lives in endeavouring to save their masters. He told me also some stories of peasants, who collected money among themselves, (for these peasants, though slaves, have land, which they cultivate and reap the fruits of), and most generously advanced it to pay their masters debts, and save him from the necessity of selling his lands, and so giving them another master; for the peasants there go along with the lands to the purchaser.

Now, I think, we may suppose, that the Egyptians were not only as wise as the Capadocians, and the peasants of the Polish nobleman above mentioned, so as to know that they were happier under the governors they had, than under their own government, but were as much attached to their governors, as the Russian peasants are to their masters; and, if so, it is evident, that they were not governed as slaves, by terror and fear of punishment, but with their own free will and consent, and with love and affection to their governors; and, that being the case, I think it is evident, that they were as

well governed, as it is possible that *the mere people*, that is, men of Hesiod's third class, can be governed. The manner in which this rank of men was governed in Egypt, had this peculiar advantage, that they were not taken from the business or trade, which was assigned them, and to which they were educated, by any care for the public, which made a great difference betwixt them and the people in the cities in Greece and those in Rome, where the people must have been much interrupted in their private business, by attending public assemblies, and discharging other offices of state: The consequence of which was, as we have seen in Athens, that the people could not live by their private industry, but were obliged to lay hold of the public money; and even with that, some of them went about begging: And in Rome, the poor's roll, in the time of Julius Caesar, consisted, as I have shown elsewhere*, of 320,000, who lived by public distributions of corn. And, besides this, a low man, who is taken from any servile business, and admitted to a share of the government, will be apt to despise and neglect his proper business, and take himself entirely, or much more than he ought to do, to the business of the state, in which he will endeavour to be a man of some consideration, and to indemnify himself, for the loss he suffers in his private business, by making profit of the public; and this necessarily will produce faction and corruption.

But though the people of Egypt had no share in the government, I think I have shown very clearly that they were not governed like slaves: And, I say, farther, that even in private families, men were not governed in that way: Nor was there a class of men among the Egyptians, that was known by the name of slaves. These were so numerous among the Greeks and Romans, that in some cities they equalled, if not exceeded, the number of freemen. But that there was no such order of men in Egypt, I think, we may be sure from the very particular account of that country, given us by Herodotus

* Origin of Language, vol. 5. p. 189.

Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, in which there is not a word said of slaves among them, who, if they had existed, must have made a class of men very different from the other classes which they mentioned, not belonging to the public, like these other classes, but the property of their masters; and if there were any doubt in the matter, the practice of India, which certainly got from Egypt its whole political system, does, in my opinion, make the matter quite clear: For Diodorus tells us, that in his time there were no slaves in India. And I have information, which I can depend upon, that there are none at present among the native Indians, that is, the Hindoos; and, indeed, where there were men of all trades ready at hand to supply the wants of every man and every family, there was no need that men should be kept in private families for that purpose, as they were among the Greeks and Romans. And, I think, slavery, considered in a political view, is a bad institution; for it is a government within a government; and it is certainly improper, that citizens of the same state should be governed by the arbitrary will of any other citizen, and not by the laws of the state. And, accordingly, in some countries, it has produced a great deal of mischief by the insurrection of slaves, and their revolt from such an unnatural government. The Romans were engaged for some years in a dangerous war (*Servile Bellum*, as they called it,) with the slaves of Sicily and of the Southern parts of Italy; and the inhabitants of Argos in Greece had a long war with their rebellious slaves, in which they at last prevailed with much difficulty*. It appears, however, that sometimes a man from another country was sold in Egypt for a slave, as Joseph was, by the Ishmaelites, to Potiphar; but there is not the least evidence that any of the Egyptians were slaves, or that there was such an order of men in Egypt. It does not appear, that Osiris brought one captive from India to Egypt. Sesostris, indeed, returned to Egypt from his conquests with a great number

F f 2

* Herodotus, lib. 6. cap. 83.

number of captives. But they were not made domestic slaves to particular men, but were employed in public works; and in the same way the Israelites were employed by Pharoah. The single instance, therefore, of Joseph being sold as a slave to a private man, does not prove that it was the general custom of Egypt to make slaves even of foreigners; and, I think, the contrary is proved by the example of Sesostris.

Thus, I think, it appears, that the third race of men, which Hesiod, in the passage I have quoted *, mentions as useless, was far from being so in Egypt: But, on the contrary, they were most useful, and, I believe, as happy as by nature they were capable of being. For as men cannot be happy without a proper education, they were as well educated as was possible for qualifying them to discharge the several offices assigned them; for which, therefore, they were fitted by education, as well as by nature. Nor does it appear, that, in any country, so much attention was given to the education of the lower sort: So that, if we could suppose, that education was the only thing necessary to form a good government, as the Greek philosophers seem to suppose, there never was a country where it was more attended to than in Egypt. In other countries, no doubt, great attention has been given to the education of the men, who, by their rank in the state, were entitled to govern. But in no country was there ever so much care taken of the education of the lower sort; and the Greek philosophers, who speak so much of the education of the citizens, mention only the education of those, who might govern as well as be governed: Which was the case of all the forms of government, that they have given us; and particularly of that which Aristotle thinks the best, and calls, by way of distinction, *πολιτια*, where the citizens were all to govern and be governed in their turns, and to practise nothing but arms and government, while the necessary arts

arts of life were to be carried on by slaves, or by barbarians living in their neighbourhood, whom Aristotle calls *περὶ τοὺς**. This is certainly a very narrow system of government, and which must be confined to one city, and accordingly it is so, both by Aristotle and Plato: Whereas the Egyptian system takes in a whole nation, and a most numerous nation, and provides men proper to discharge all the offices of life, even the meanest.

Further the division of the people, into so many classes or *casts*, as they are called in India, according to the different arts which they profess, must, I think, have made them excel more in their several arts and professions, than, I believe, any people in any other country ever did. In other countries, and particularly in the popular governments of Greece, men had several employments: For besides the particular art which they professed, they had the business of the state, to which they were obliged to attend. Thus a citizen of Athens, besides his particular business, such as that of a soldier, a sailor, a merchant, or whatever other business he might think proper to apply to in order to acquire money, was obliged to attend the public assemblies, to be a judge, or to discharge any other office of the state, that by lot might fall on him. Now, I say, it is impossible, when a man practices so many trades, that he can excel in any one of them†: Whereas the citizens of Egypt, following only one profession, and being educated for that profession in the best way possible, must have excelled in it. And there must have been an emulation among all those practising the same profession, which must have made them strive to outdo one another. And this emulation would take place, not only in the lower classes, but also among the priests; where there would not only be emulation among

* Lib. 4. *de republica*. cap. 8. and 9. and lib. 7. cap. 13.

† Homer says of Margites, who was a *Jack of all Trades*, that

Πολλὰ δ' ἐκίχθητο ἔργα, καὶ οὐδ' ἐκίχθητο κατὰ

mong those of the same college, but among the different colleges, such as those of Thebes and of Heliopolis; which last, as Herodotus tells us, had the reputation of being the most learned. Now, it is emulation that makes men strive to excel in the several arts and professions; for it proceeds from a sense of *honour*, the great animating principle of the political system, and which gives life and vigour to all the actions of men both in public and private life; and, if that principle be well directed by the wisdom of the state, the government must necessarily be good and the people happy. It is this principle which distinguishes essentially, as I have observed*, a soldier from a slave, though he have no will of his own, but be governed entirely by his officer. It was this principle that made the king of Sparta and his 300 Spartiates, sacrifice their lives so gloriously for the liberties of Greece. It was the

——— *Laudum immensa cupido,*

as Virgil expresses it, which made the Romans so great a people and so magnanimous, that 70,000. of them lay upon the field of battle of Cannae, without one man surrendering himself a prisoner†. And, to descend to common life, it is this principle which makes what we call *fashion* among us, a law more prevalent than any law human or divine, though the sanction of it be nothing else, but the want of the praise which we should otherwise have had, if we had complied with the fashion.

And this leads to an observation, which, I think, it is not improper here to make: As there can be no sense of what is honourable and praise-worthy, without a sense, at the same time, of what is beautiful, graceful, and becoming, in sentiments and actions, this sense is, therefore, not only the foundation of virtue and of the fine arts, but also of government; and, indeed, it appears, that there can be

nothing

* Page 209. of this volume.

† See Vol. V. of Origin of Language p. 221.

nothing valuable among men without it; nor is there any sentiment so universal among men. We have yet discovered no nation so barbarous, that has not some idea of beauty, at least in outward form, and particularly in their own dress, if they have any. And even a sense of the beauty of sentiment and character, we find in people very little advanced in civility and the common arts of life, such as the New Zealanders and the people of the Pelew Islands, of both of whom I have spoken elsewhere*; and in whatever we pursue, we think we perceive something fine and praise-worthy. The love of money is one of our most sordid passions; yet the miser is vain of his money. Now, there cannot be vanity, as I have elsewhere shown†, without a sense of the graceful and becoming; and such monsters of gluttony, luxury, and intemperance of every kind, as Vitellius and Heliogabalus, thought, no doubt, that their manner of living was becoming and suitable to the dignity of a Roman emperor. In short, it appears to me, that those, who deny that any such sense is natural to man, are entirely ignorant of human nature, not knowing that it is the principle the most prevalent in it; and if it be perverted, it is the cause of almost all our vices and follies, and is the greatest depravity of human nature, but, if rightly directed, it makes the greatest perfection of our nature, and is the only source of happiness to the intellectual nature, even to the divine: For God had pleasure in the production of the universe, because he saw that it was *beautiful*; for so the Hebrew word is translated in the Septuagint.

As the prosperity of the nation is the end proposed, or that should be proposed by government, let us consider in this view the Egyptian government. The prosperity of every nation must depend upon three things; the health, the morals, and the numbers, of the people.

* Page 55. of this volume.

† Volume II. of this work p. 128.

people. Without health and morals, no people can be happy; and without numbers, they cannot be a great or powerful nation. As to the health of the people, we know very certainly that their neither is, nor ever was, upon the earth, a country where health was more studied, or more proper means used, both to preserve it, and to restore it when lost. They had physicians for each disease; and they had prescriptions for the cure of diseases: And which prescriptions had come down to them from the remotest antiquity, I think, very probably from the reigns of their Dæmons; which rules their physicians were obliged to follow: And if they deviated from them, it was at their own risk; for if the patient died, they themselves suffered death. But what I admire most in their phyfic, was their application of it, not only to the cure of diseases, but to the prevention of them, and to the preservation of health, which is of greater value than the restoring of it when lost. For this purpose, Herodotus tells us, that they cleansed their bodies very thoroughly by vomiting, purging, and glystering, for three days successively in the beginning of each month. And the reason they gave for it was a good one, that, in such a climate as theirs, there were not those changes of weather, which produce so many diseases in other countries: So that the only cause of disease, among them, was intemperance in eating and drinking; to prevent the effects of which, they cleansed themselves in the manner I have mentioned. This they practised when Herodotus was among them: But when Diodorus was there, they took their phyfic more frequently, but not at once, and not so violently; and the priests practised a regimen which I am sure, from my own experience, must have contributed very much to their health; and that was bathing in cold water: This they did twice in the day, and as often at night. The consequence of this care of health among the Egyptians was, as Herodotus informs us, that they were the healthiest of all men, excepting only the Lybians, who lived the life of savages: And if we consider that they

all

all lived in cities, which is certainly a life not so healthy as the country life, and that the land was overflowed, for some months in the year, by the river, during which time they may be said to have lived in the water; this alone is a sufficient proof, that, in the practice of this great art of the political system, they must have excelled all the world.

As to Morals, I think, in that respect too, they must have exceeded all the civilized nations of which we have heard: For, in the first place, they were, as Herodotus tells us, the most religious of men. Now it is impossible that religion, especially when it is such a religion as the Egyptian, which, as I have observed, had nothing barbarous or inhuman in it, should not improve the morals of men. Besides that, they had not these two great diseases of the political system, which produce so much disorder in it, and are the source of the greatest part of the vices and crimes among men; I mean *wealth* and *indigence*: For, as they had no foreign commerce, they could not accumulate wealth in that way. Their whole wealth was their land; and it was divided in such a way, that, I think, it was not possible that any man should acquire wealth by the possession of it: For the land all belonged to the King, to the Priests, or to the Soldiers. Now these orders of men possessed no lands themselves, (for, otherwise, they must have gone out of the class in which they were placed by the constitution, and have become farmers), but had the rents paid by the farmers, or herdsmen, who possessed them, and who paid their rents to the King and to the other two classes of men; not however to the individuals of these classes, but to the whole of them, to be divided among them. The Egyptians, therefore, may be said to have enjoyed that blessing, which *Agur* prayed for, of neither poverty nor wealth. Neither had they, as I have observed, any foreign commerce, by which we know that vices as well as diseases are imported into a country; and even the commerce in their own country was carried on, not by money, as among us, but in the antient pri-

mitive way by exchange of commodities. For Herodotus tells us, that the Lydians were the first who coined money*: And from the same author we learn, that the Egyptians borrowed none of their customs from other nations. It is true, that the Egyptians had a great deal of gold and silver, more perhaps than any other people ever had. But there is no evidence that they coined any of it, any more than the Greeks did at the time of the Trojan war, who had also gold and silver among them, which they gave in exchange for other commodities, weighing it in talents; and in this way it no doubt passed among the Egyptians. The Egyptians, therefore, had not among them that *root of all evil*, money, which, by its accumulation and easy circulation, does more mischief than any other kind of wealth, and is more productive of those two great diseases of the political body, the wealth of the few, and the indigence of the many; and besides, it makes a greater and quicker circulation of vice and folly in a country, than commerce by exchange can do.—That there could not be great wealth in Egypt, I have already shown: And as to indigence among them, neither Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, nor any other author, who has treated of Egypt, have said a word of it; which they certainly would not have failed to have done, if it had been so great as it was in some other antient states, such as that of Athens and Rome. If any man was to give such a description of England, as Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus have given us of Egypt, he would not omit to tell us, that a very considerable part of the people subsisted upon public or private charity. From the silence, therefore, of authors with respect to a thing of such importance in the polity of a country, I think I may infer, that there was no such indigence in Egypt, as we hear of in other countries, both antient and modern. And, if there was no such indigence, I think, we may infer, that there were no very great estates, nor any great inequality in the fortunes of private men; for great wealth of some private men, and great poverty of others, have al-

* Lib. 1. cap. 94.

ways gone together in all countries. But in those countries, wealth consisted chiefly in coined money, which, as it circulates in the easiest and most private way, enables men to collect wealth much more easily than they can do, when gold and silver is only a commodity like herds and flocks.

There was not, therefore, in Egypt that inequality of fortune among the citizens, that has produced so much disorder in other states. And, indeed, I may say, that the distinction of rich and poor has produced more internal disturbances, more factions and disorders, which have very often ended in the ruin of the state, than perhaps any other thing. And as the Egyptians had not money, nor any trade with foreign countries, they had no foreign luxury, but lived entirely upon the produce of their own country.

The last great article in the system of government is the Numbers of the people. In this the Egyptians appear to me to have exceeded all the nations that ever existed, without exception even of the Indian, which, we are told, was in antient times a very populous nation, and is so at this day. In the reign of Amasis, Herodotus tells us, that there were 20,000 cities in Egypt. Diodorus makes them only 18,000; and says, that was the number recorded in the books of the Priests*. And even after they had fallen under the dominion of the Persians, and then of the Macedonians, their numbers continued to increase, their polity still remaining the same: For Diodorus tells us, that under Ptolemy Lagus, the number of their cities amounted to 30,000; which number, he says, continued to his time†. And we are not to suppose, that what they called cities were nothing but small villages; but, that they were truly what might be called cities, some of them no doubt greater or lesser than

G g 2

others;

* Lib. 1. cap. 31.

† Ibidem.

others; for, as the people lived altogether in cities, (and indeed they could not live otherwise during the months that the country was overflowed), and as those cities were raised upon mounts, at a great expence of labour, to secure them against the inundation, we must suppose that they consisted of a great number of houses, and were inhabited by many men, who otherwise could not have lived in the country. The way that we commonly judge of the populousness of countries, is by the numbers of the individuals living in it; and we say, that in such or such a country there are so many millions of men. But to ascertain this, is a matter of very great difficulty; nor do I know, that the numbers of people in any country have been properly ascertained in that way. Whereas the cities in a country may be easily numbered: So that, I think, that, in counting the cities in Egypt, there could hardly be any mistake.

This number of people will not appear incredible, even in so small a country as Egypt, which was no more than a valley betwixt the Arabian Mountains on one side, and the Lybian on the other, if we consider the manners and customs of the people. Among them, I am persuaded, every man was married; and, that, they held it to be a religious duty to communicate to children the life that they had got from their parents. This is the opinion of the Indians at this day; and, as I am persuaded they got their customs and manners, as well as their polity and their arts and sciences, from the Egyptians, I think it is highly probable, that they adopted this Egyptian custom likewise. Then there was no such thing as exposing children among the Egyptians, such as was practised among the Greeks and Romans; but all their children, legitimate and illegitimate, were brought up, and at the smallest expence, chiefly upon the herbs which the river produced, as Diodorus Siculus informs us. Then that vice, which was so common among the Greeks and Romans, and

and which, as Aristotle informs us *, was permitted, and even encouraged by the polity of Crete, in order to prevent the too great increase of the people, I mean sodomy, was not known in Egypt. And when to these considerations we join this, that in so healthy a country as Egypt, few or no children would die under age; whereas, among us, many more than a half that are born, do not live to be men and women;—When we join, I say, all these considerations together, it will by no means appear incredible, that the numbers of people in Egypt should have been so very great; so great, that they must have been quite overstocked with people, many more than their land or water, fruitful as they were, could maintain, and that in not many generations, if they had not discharged themselves by colonies, which they sent to different countries, by which they at the same time propagated their arts and sciences. Of these colonies their Priests named many, which no doubt were set down in their sacred books, but of some of which the Greek historians seem to have doubted. But, for my part, though they had not said a word of the colonies they sent out, I should have believed, that it was impossible by the nature of things, that they must not have sent out a great many.

What made the numbers of the people in Egypt so very great, was a thing which happened in Egypt, and I believe no where else. In other countries a great deal of land has, at some time or another, been inundated by the sea, or by rivers, and in that way so much land taken from the inhabitants: Whereas in Egypt there was a very great addition made to the country; and which I think must have been richer, and more productive of every thing for the sustenance of man, than the old country. What I mean is the addition of the Delta, or lower Egypt, to the upper; which addition, as Herodotus tells us, was the gift of the river, being produced by the earth, which the river brought with it from

* Lib. 2. *De Republica*, cap. 10.

from *Æthopia* when it overflowed. This addition began to be made after the reign of the Gods, as the Egyptians called their Daemon Kings, had ceased. Such an increase of land must have made a wonderful increase of people, more than, I believe, were in Upper Egypt. And this new created land must have added not only a great deal to the numbers of the people, but also to the progress of learning and of arts and sciences. In Upper Egypt it does not appear that there was more than one college of Priests, that of Thebes; but in the Delta there were several, and particularly one, mentioned by Herodotus, at Heliopolis, where he says, there were the most learned Priests with whom he conversed. Now it is evident, that by the increase of the number of colleges, learning must have been increased; for besides the increase of the numbers employed in learning, there must have been, as I have observed, an emulation among the several colleges, which must have contributed very much to the advancement of knowledge. I will only add farther upon this subject, that this so wonderful an event, as the creation of a new country, must have happened by the providence of God, which had destined that Egypt should be the parent country of all arts and sciences; and for that purpose should abound more than any other country in numbers of men, so as to be able by the colonies, which it sent out, to propagate arts and sciences all over the earth then known; for which purpose Egypt, as I shall show afterwards, was better situated than any other country.

Thus I think I have proved that the Egyptian government answered the three great purposes proposed by government, the Health, the Morals, and the Numbers of the people.

And thus much may suffice for the internal government of Egypt. As to their transactions with other nations, their government was in this respect more remarkable, perhaps, and more distinguished from that

that of other nations, than in any thing else that I have mentioned. They were the greatest conquerors of whom we read : Their Dæmon King, Osiris, overran a great part of India : And their human King, Sesostris, went still farther in that country, and past the Ganges, which neither Osiris nor Alexander did ; and he appears to have overrun all the rest of Asia, and a part of Europe as far as Thrace. But they made no provinces of the countries they conquered, as the Romans did ; nor imposed any tribute upon them. Osiris overran that great country of India, for no other purpose, as appears, except to introduce among them civility and arts ; and Sesostris, though he was in India too, and made great conquests in Asia, and even in Europe, and though he made captives whom he employed in the way I have mentioned *, imposed no tribute upon the nations he conquered, nor gave them any king or ruler, but left them to chuse rulers for themselves, and to be governed by their own laws.

The Egyptians, therefore, did not erect a great Empire, such as those of the Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Macedonians, and Romans ; which I hold to have been the principal causes of the present desolation of the Earth : Whereas the Egyptians peopled several countries with their colonies, and propagated their arts and sciences to the most distant parts of the earth. The polity of the Egyptians, therefore, not only made themselves very happy, but may be said to have been a blessing to human kind, and the greatest blessing that man can bestow upon man, if it be true, as I think I shall show it is, that from Egypt all arts and sciences are originally derived.

Such being the nature of the Egyptian government, both at home and abroad, I think I may conclude, that it was more perfect than any government that ever existed on this earth, or was imagined by the

* See p. 227.

the Greek philosophers ; that it was as perfect as any government on this earth can be ; and that the people, who lived under it, must have been very happy, and indeed I believe the happiest of men : Nor do I think they could have been otherwise, as they were governed not only by religion, but by philosophy, without which, as Plato tells us, no people can be happy ; nor can there, says he, be any end of human misery, unless kings become philosophers, or philosophers kings.

If any doubt should remain of the government of Egypt being so perfect a government, the duration of it would be sufficient proof: For in government, as well as in every thing else, what is most perfect in the form will last the longest. Of the duration of the government of Egypt I have already spoken*. It is proved by a chronological monument, such as is not to be found, nor ever was to be found, in any other country in the world ; I mean the statues of the High Priests of Jupiter in Thebes : And, besides these, the numbers of the years of the reigns of their Kings were set down, as Herodotus informs us, in the books of their Priests, whose account of these Kings was so exact, that they set down their stature, as Diodorus Siculus informs us. During all this prodigious number of years which their government lasted, from Menes their first human King, (for I reckon not the reigns of their Gods, though I believe them to have been as real Kings as the human Kings, and their reigns were very much longer), down to the Persian conquest, there was no change of the government ; nor during all that time was there so much as an attempt to change the government, or any rebellion against their established Kings, or assassination of them, nor any thing that can possibly be called a civil war, though, after the Greeks had found the way into the country, there were two disputes about the succession to the Crown, but each of them was terminated

* Page 133.

minated by a single battle: And there were no proscriptions and capital punishments, such as accompanied the civil wars in Rome, or massacres, such as we read of in other countries upon like occasions. As to the Æthiopian Kings, who reigned in Egypt, it appears that they got the Crown without any conquest or civil war: And as the Egyptians were undoubtedly a colony from Æthiopia, as Diodorus has shown, (who says, that the land of Egypt, as well as the people, came from Æthiopia), I think it is likely that they succeeded with the consent of the nation; for the Crown in Egypt does not appear to have ever been hereditary or the property of any family. One of these Æthiopian Kings, after he had reigned some years, voluntarily resigned the Crown: Nor does it appear, that any of them made, or attempted to make, any change in the constitution or form of government, nor introduced any new manners or customs among the people. And, indeed, the manners of the two countries were so like, that there could hardly be any thing of that kind: And the form of government in both countries was so far the same, that the Priests were the governing men.

Thus it appears, that the government in Egypt had every mark of a perfect form of Government, and particularly its duration, which, compared with that of other governments, of which we read, is most extraordinary; nor is there any thing like it to be found in the history of man, except the duration of the Polity of India, which, as it was derived from the Polity of Egypt, is another proof of the excellence of that polity. The Polity of India still continues the same, notwithstanding the many establishments of foreigners in that country, and the many conquests that have been made of it, first by Gengischan, then by Tamerlane and the Mogul Tartars, after them by the French and English, who are in possession at present of a great part of the country; and the Portugeese have also settlements there: Yet, notwithstanding all these conquests, and the frequent intercourse they

must have had with so many foreigners settled in their country, the Hindoos, that is the native Indians, preserve the antient form of polity, by which the people were divided into so many classes, or *casts*, as the Indians call them, kept distinct from one another, and not intermixed by marriages. The first of these casts is the Bramins, who are precisely what the Priests in Egypt were; for they have the care of the religion of the country. They are the counsellors of the Rajahs or antient Princes of the country; and they are the depositaries of the arts and sciences, which the Egyptians imported into India, and particularly of that language, of most wonderful art, called the Shanacrit, and which I hope to be able to prove was the antient language of Egypt. They have also a military cast, which they call Rajaputs; and who are so much fitted, both by their nature and education, to be soldiers, that, as I am informed by our officers who have been in India, they are the best men among our Seapoys, when they can be got; but it is not easy to get them, as they are of so dignified a cast. And, besides these two highest casts, they have inferior casts, such as those of farmers, herdsmen, &c.; and which are all kept separate from one another, as the same classes were in Egypt. And, as the Egyptians were so happy under their government, the Indians, I am told, are likewise very happy under the same form of government, notwithstanding all the disturbances that they have met with in later times from foreigners; but which have made them alter nothing of their customs and manners. Mr Hastings, who is a man of great sense and observation as well as of learning, and who was 32 years in India, and governor there for 13 of these years, tells me, that he thinks them the happiest people he has ever known: And, as to their polity, he says, that their division into casts, (a singularity of the Egyptian government, which is only preserved in India), makes all their business of life go on much better than it would otherwise do; as they have there no man of many trades, but every man has a business of his own, to which he wholly applies himself. And, indeed, that the division of the
several

several arts and professions among different classes of men, who, by nature and education, were fitted to excel in those several arts, was a most wise and political institution, I think, cannot be doubted; for, if men in a state are at liberty to practise any business or profession, without being fitted for it either by nature or education, the consequence necessarily must be, that those arts will, for the greater part, be very ill practised. If in a private family, the servants have not each of them a particular business allotted them, but every one of them is to do every thing, it is evident that the whole business of that family will be very ill managed. Now, a state is to be considered as a great family; and, indeed, all states were originally composed of associations of families*.

It may be also observed, as one great advantage of this division of the people according to their several occupations, that every man must be contented with his own situation so far, at least, that he cannot aspire to be of any higher cast; and therefore his only ambition must be, to excel in his own Cast: Whereas in other countries, where there are no such classes of men, there are no bounds set to the ambition of any man, but every man attempts to rise as high as he can. Now, this must needs make men unquiet and discontented. The incapacity, therefore, of rising higher than their Cast, must, I think, of itself, make the Hindoos happier than the people of other countries. The only ambition they can have, is to excel in their several professions, and in no other. And this ambition must produce an emulation, which, as I have observed, must make them excel in their several arts; and which must be much greater among those of the same art, than among those professing different arts; and, indeed, among these there can hardly be any emulation at all, especially when it is impossible that a man of the lower cast can rise to a higher. He therefore will not compare himself with those above him, but will be contented if he can out do those of the same

H h 2

cast :

* See p. 176. of this vol.

cast: And this, among others, I think, is one great advantage of the division of the people into classes according to their several employments. For my own part, I have heard so much of the Hindoos, and of the bravery and fidelity of those who are in our service, that there is no people I should desire more to be acquainted with; and if I could acquire knowledge enough of their learned language, so as to read their books of science, of which, I am informed by Sir William Jones, they have a great many upon every subject, I believe I should learn more of the antient Egyptian philosophy, which was brought to Greece by Pythagoras, and which I hold to be the only genuine philosophy, than is to be found in the Greek books. In short, I consider India as Egypt still preserved to us; and, if I were there, I should consider myself as in the parent country of all arts and sciences, where they were best cultivated, and brought to the greatest degree of perfection.

CHAR

C H A P. XII.

Comparison of the present State of Egypt with its antient State.—
The change more for the worse than in any other country.—In Herodotus's time, it was a country more wonderful than all the other countries upon earth.—Of its climate, and its river.—The climate not liable to excess either of hot or cold, dry or wet.—The changes of these produce many diseases among men.—The river more wonderful than the climate.—It has created a country in Egypt,—and makes this country wonderfully fruitful by renewing the soil of it.—Without that, the land of Egypt could not have lasted or maintained so many people.—Examples to prove this.—The Nile made agriculture in Egypt a very easy art, which is so laborious in other countries.—It delivered them from the reproach of feeding upon dung.—The river, besides, yeilded many plants of different kinds, upon which the inhabitants of the marshy part of Egypt lived.—The land of Egypt fertile as well as the water.—It produced wheat and barley which grew wild there, and no where else.—Of the works of art in Egypt.—The first and greatest work of that kind, the mounds of earth, upon which the cities were built, and without which the country could not have been inhabited.—The second great work of art in Egypt, was the Lake of Mæris;—a most useful work,—of wonderful circumference and depth.—The third great work of Egypt, was the Labyrinth.—The fourth, the Pyramids,—the last of the great works of Egypt, as Herodotus has arranged them, but such, that, if they had not been still extant, we could not have believed in the other wonders of Egypt.—The greatest work of art among the Egyptians, was their Government,—the subject of which was Men,
and

and not materials such as stone and brick.—In this they exceeded all the world.—All these arts, joined with their prodigious numbers, and the arts and sciences they invented, make them the most wonderful people on earth.—Of the present state of Egypt,—wonderfully changed for the worse,—first, as to the numbers of the people.—The antient Egyptian Race not to be found in Egypt: So that the nation may be said to be annihilated.—Instead of being the most fruitful country in the world, not able to maintain the few inhabitants that are in it: And, instead of being the healthiest country in the world, it is now the seat of disease.

IN this chapter I propose to compare the antient with the present state of Egypt; a comparison which will exhibit an alteration, and a change for the worse, such as is not to be found in any other country upon the earth, though in all countries the changes have been very great in latter times, and I am afraid none for the better.

Herodotus has said, that, in his time, Egypt exhibited more wonders, both of nature and of art, than all the countries of the earth put together*: And he mentions particularly their heaven, or climate they enjoyed, and their river so different from other rivers, and also the manners of the people. As to their climate, the country is in such a latitude, as not to be liable to any excess, either of heat or cold, nor of dry or of wet. In Upper Egypt it never rains; or if it did, it was, in antient times, accounted a prodigy; which, Herodotus tells us, was the case before the Persian conquest; and then it only rained in drops: And in Lower Egypt it rains but seldom; nor have they any of those fogs or mists, which make other climates, less favoured by Heaven, so unwholesome. They have not, therefore, that succession of hot and cold, dry and moist, nor in general that

* Lib. 2. cap. 35.

that change of weather, which, as the same author observes, affects the human body so much, and produces so many diseases.

Their river was still more wonderful than their sky; for there may perhaps be other climates as good as that of Egypt, but there is no river, known, like the Nile, or which has produced so wonderful an effect as the production of a great country; I mean the *Delta*, which, as Herodotus tells us, was the gift of the river: And not only has produced it, but, by annually overflowing it and the Upper Egypt, has made them both the most fruitful countries in the world. Other rivers by overflowing only water the soil, and prevent the bad effects of excessive drought; whereas the Nile not only waters the soil, but annually renews it, by bringing from *Æthiopia* a very rich earth, which it deposits upon the plains of Egypt, while it stagnates. Nor do I think it is possible, that without such renewal, Egypt could have maintained so many millions of people for so many thousand years, nor have invented so many arts and sciences, and by their colonies propagated them to so many countries. For the same soil, however good, must be exhausted at last by continued cropping for a great number of years, notwithstanding any dung we can give it; for we carry off, in every crop, more of the vegetable earth than we can add to it by the richest dunging; and of what remains we exhaust at last the seminal virtue. I was told by a gentleman employed by Government to survey the West India Islands, which we took from the French in the war before the last, that he was informed, that some of these Islands, when they were first cultivated, produced 20 crops of sugar without dung or changing the plant; whereas in our Island of Barbadoes, which has been very long in culture, they must dung and change the plant every year. Palestine, which was once a most fruitful country, and maintained a prodigious number of inhabitants, is now so much exhausted, that it is little better than a sandy desert.

The

The Nile, by overflowing and renewing the soil, made agriculture, which in other countries is an art requiring much labour and skill, a matter of great ease in Egypt: For, as Herodotus has told us*, the farmer there, was not obliged to plough or dig the ground; but after the river was retired, he had no more to do, but to sow his seed upon the wet mud, and then employ swine to tread it in; and in this way he had a plentiful crop, which he saved himself also the trouble of threshing by treading the grain out with swine.

Another advantage the Egyptians had by the overflowing of the river was, that they escaped the reproach which the King of Æthiopia cast upon the Persians, that they lived upon dung; for having asked the Persian ambassadors upon what they lived, and being told it was upon wheat, which was raised among them, as among us, from land dunged, he said that it was no wonder that they lived so short time, when they fed upon dung †: And it is certain, that all the fruits of the earth must have in them more or less of the manure by which they are raised and nourished: And I have no doubt, but that many diseases are produced among us and other nations in Europe by our being fed in that way; and I hold it to be one reason of the great health of the Egyptians, that all the corn they ate was not raised from dung, but from new earth brought down by the river. Whereas, we feed upon fruits raised in our fields and gardens from the dung of other animals; and those, who live in great towns, feed upon fruits, a great part of which is raised from their own dung; for that is a principal part of the manure of fields and gardens near to a great city. Now, we can hardly imagine a food more unnatural than this.

And not only did the river produce the most plentiful crops without any culture, but it abounded so much with fish, and with herbs, which

* Lib. 2. cap. 14.

† Herodotus, Lib. 3. cap. 22.

which it produced, particularly the *Lotus*, *Agrostis*, and *Biblus*, that it maintained numbers of men without the use of any corn: For Herodotus mentions a part of Egypt which was altogether marshy, where the inhabitants neither sowed nor reaped, but lived entirely upon the produce of the river; and Diodorus Siculus tells us, that, even in the country that was sown, the children were brought up chiefly upon plants that grew in the river, with little or no expence to their parents.

But not only was the water thus bountiful to the inhabitants, but the earth, I imagine, was of the best kind, producing plants which were to be found in no other country: So that I believe we owe to Egypt the very bread we eat; for wheat and barley, and every other species of grain, must have grown wild in some country before they were cultivated; and, accordingly, Diodorus Siculus tells us, that the wheat was a wild plant in Egypt before Isis taught the people the culture of it. Now, I do not believe that the common wheat, and much less the finest kind of it, which they called *Zea*, and which was the *Far* of the Romans, and the food of the best people in Egypt*, is, at present, or was, at any time, the natural produce of any other country. The barley, too, of which we make our ale, and upon which the Greeks fed before they got the use of wheat, was, I am persuaded, likewise a native of Egypt, and of no other country; and so also was the vine, which Osiris carried to India and taught the Indians the culture of. And if it went as far as India, we may presume that it went to Greece, and that the Greeks learned the culture of it, as well as other arts, from the Egyptians.

Herodotus has likewise mentioned the works of art in Egypt, as being most wonderful, as well as those of nature. I will say something upon this subject likewise; and, I will begin with one of them, which, I think, was as necessary as it was wonderful, and in that

Vol. IV. I respect

* Herodotus, Lib. 2. cap. 36.

respect differed materially from the Pyramids, which, though works very wonderful, were certainly not necessary ; and it differed from the Pyramids also in this respect, that the Pyramids were confined to particular spots, whereas this great work was all over the country. The work I mean is, the building of so many cities upon mounds of earth, raised above the overflowing of the river ; without which the country could not have been inhabited for near one half of the year, as Herodotus informs us *. Now what a labour it must have been to place not single houses, but cities, to the number of 20,000, upon the tops of artificial mounds. How high those mounds must have been, we may judge from what Herodotus tells us of the overflowing of the river, which, he says, covered not only the Delta of Egypt, but sometimes a part of Lybia upon one side, and of Arabia on the other side, and to the extent of two days journey on each side † : And more particularly he informs us, that, in his time, if it did not rise 15 or 16 cubits at least, it did not cover the country ‡ ; so that the mounds, upon which the cities were built, must have been more than 24 feet high. When the river overflowed, the whole of Egypt was a sea, and the cities only appeared ; which, therefore, he compares to the Cyclade Islands in the Egæan Sea ||, that is what we call the Archipelago Islands. To this work of nature, I think it was not improper to compare this greatest, and, at the same time, most useful, work of man.

The next most useful work of the Egyptians, and the most wonderful too, was the Lake Mæris, which was about 400 English miles in circumference, and 50 fathoms deep where it was deepest. This lake received the waters of the Nile when it overflowed, and retained them when it retired: So that it was a reservoir for those waters,

from

* Lib. 2. cap. 19.

† Ibidem.

‡ Ibid. cap. 13.

|| Ibid. cap. 96. Diod. Siculus says the same thing. Lib. 1. cap. 23.

from which they were derived by many canals to every part of the country, which wanted them. Of this wonderful work a small remain is yet to be seen.

The next most wonderful work in Egypt was, the Palace of the 12 Kings, built in the form of a Labyrinth. Of this there is no vestige, as far as I know, remaining.

The last of the wonders of art in this country, were the Pyramids; of which there are three still remaining, one of these called the Great Pyramid, of stupendous size, covering about eight acres of ground as it stands at present; but it must have covered more when Herodotus saw it, according to his description of it. If these Pyramids had not been still extant, I doubt whether we should have believed in the other wonders of Egypt related to us by Herodotus. And, yet the Pyramids were the least of the wonders of the works of men in Egypt, according to the account Herodotus gives of them; for he says the Labyrinth exceeded the Pyramids, as much as it was exceeded by the Lake Mæris.

But I have not yet mentioned the greatest of all the arts, in which they excelled; the materials of which are not stone and mortar, earth or water, but men, the noblest subject of art upon this earth. By this description the reader will readily understand that I mean the art of government, in which I think I have shown that the Egyptians exceeded all the world. When to these works of nature and of art I join the prodigious numbers of the people, their genius, and their invention of so many arts and sciences, their conquests too, and the use they made of these conquests, I think we need not hesitate to pronounce, with Herodotus*, that Egypt was the most wonderful country on earth, and more wonderful than all the other countries put together. And, I think, I may add with Diodorus

I i 2

Siculus,

* Herod. Lib. 2. cap. 35.

Siculus *, that they were a most happy people, enjoying all those advantages from nature, which I have mentioned, of air, earth, and water; likewise a form of government, which, I think, I have shown to be the best that ever was practised or even imagined; and besides all these, the arts and sciences they invented, by which they made the civil life compleat.

Let us now compare the present state of Egypt with its antient state, as I have described it; and the change for the worse will appear wonderful;—greater, as I have said, than is to be found in any other country on earth. Egypt was once, as I have shown, the most populous country in the world; and now it may be said to be a desert compared with what it was formerly. It is inhabited at present by Turks and Arabs, and a mongrel race of people, they call *Copts*, who have a mixture, it is said, of the antient Egyptian blood. But black, woolly-haired men, such as the antient Egyptians were, but with features very different from those of the negroes, are not now to be found in Egypt; and, according to my information, are only to be seen in the Island of Meroe, formed by the Nile in Æthiopia, but who probably are Æthiopians; so that the whole Egyptian nation may be said to be extinct. Instead of being the best governed country, as it formerly was, I believe there is no country at present worse governed.

There was a Scotch ship from Aberdeen, which, a year or two ago, went to the Levant, and was employed to carry corn from different parts of Africa to Alexandria. And, though there had been a great many ships, before this Aberdeen ship, employed in the same way, yet, when she came to Alexandria with her cargo of corn, there were people dying every day of hunger. This information I had from one of the sailors; who told me that the scarcity was not

* Lib. 1. cap. 69.

not owing to the Nile not overflowing as usual, but to the bad government of the country, and the neglect of agriculture. Now, how extraordinary a change is this, from a country so populous as antient Egypt was, and abounding so much with corn and every other necessary of life, to a country so thinly inhabited as Egypt is at present, and where the few, that are left in it, are dying for want of bread? Instead of being the healthiest of all civilized countries, it may now be said to be the seat of disease: For the plague is seldom out of it; and almost all the plagues, which at different times have afflicted Europe, have come originally from Egypt. And besides the plague, which at times makes prodigious havoc among them, they are eaten while alive by worms, and particularly by one very great worm, called the tape-worm*.

* See Hasselquist's Travels.

CHAP.

C H A P. XIII.

Recapitulation of what has been said in the former chapter.—The subject of the origin of the arts and sciences continued.—The art of government invented in Egypt, and brought to perfection.—Of the necessary arts of life there invented.—Language also will be shown to have been there invented.—The use of fire discovered in Egypt;—and the use of it in making glass, which was unknown to the Greeks and Romans.—Glass coloured like precious stones, also known to them;—likewise the hatching of chickens without incubation.—Of the art of music:—It was practised in Egypt for the best purposes:—As it was practised there, it was also there invented.—The practice of it very antient in Egypt.—It was invented under the Dæmon Kings,—and was preserved with the greatest care, and no innovation of it suffered.—For this purpose, there must have been a notation of it.—An art of music of very difficult invention, being the application of numbers to the tones of the human voice or of instruments,—a short account given of the difficulty of the invention.—It could only have been invented in a country such as Egypt, where arts and sciences were cultivated.—The Greek music no better than the music of the Hurons, till Pythagoras brought the art into Greece from Egypt.—From thence they only got the Diatonic Scale.—To this they added the Chromatic and the Enharmonic.—This refinement of music not so proper for the useful purposes to which the Egyptians applied it.—The Greeks had also modes of music, such as the Dorian, the Phrygian, and Lydian.—The writing art more connected with language than music.—It is language not pronounced.—A wonderful art, by which sounds are made visible,—a progress
in

in the writing art as in every other.—At first, the ideas were directly represented, by figures natural or symbolical.—These last were what is called Hieroglyphics.—Of the assistance given to our intellect by our senses, and how wonderfully the two concur to carry on man in the pursuit of knowledge.—The advantages of the writing art.—This art invented in Egypt by a Dæmon, called Theuth.—But he invented only the notation of the elemental sounds by written characters.—The analysis of language, into elemental sounds, was before his time, under the Dæmon Kings.

IN the preceeding chapter I have given a pretty full account of the country of Egypt and the people, and particularly of their government, of which I have said a great deal, I hope the reader will not think too much, as it is a thing so essential in the history of man, that without it there could have been no civil society, nor consequently any progress made by man in this life towards a better in the world to come. I go on now with what is the proper subject of this book,—the origin of arts and sciences. Of one of these, and that without which other arts and sciences never could have been invented, and of which, therefore, I have treated at so great length, I mean the last mentioned art of government, I think it is evident, that Egypt must have been the parent country; for, as it was the oldest civilized country, they could not have borrowed the art from any other, and therefore they must have invented it themselves; and, I think, I have shown, that they not only invented it, but brought it to the greatest perfection. In the preceeding chapters I have treated of other arts, which they invented, particularly the art of agriculture; and, I think, I have shown that we owe to them the bread we eat, and the wine and the ale we drink. I think I have also shown, that we owe to them the clothes we wear,

and

and that we have been also taught by them to make that artificial defence against the weather, which we call a *boufe*, instead of those rocks and caves which were the only protection that men had against the injuries of the weather in the natural state. And in this way, I think, I have shown, that the Egyptians were the inventors of all the necessary arts of life in the civilized state. And if I can further prove that they were the inventors of language, without which no other art could have been invented, I think I shall have proved, what I have frequently thrown out in the course of this work, that Egypt was the parent country of all arts and sciences, and even of civil society itself, which could not have been formed or carried on without the use of language. For the purpose of agriculture and building, metallurgy was necessary. The Egyptians, therefore, first taught men to dig into the bowels of the earth, and from thence to bring forth metals. But these could have been of little or no use without the use of fire, a thing, as I have shown*, unknown to nations who are so far advanced in the civil life, as to have got the use of speech. Of this so useful invention, therefore, we must give the honour to the Egyptians. And there was one use of fire, which was unknown to the Greeks and Romans, but was practised in Egypt, I mean the making of glass; for Maillet, the French Consul in Egypt, in the account he has given us of that country, tells us, that he has seen windows of glass in some cases of mummies. We owe, therefore, likewise to the Egyptians this invention, which in modern times has been of so much use and ornament to us. And the same Maillet tells us, that there has been found, in the cases of some mummies, pieces of glass coloured, resembling precious stones, like the French paste. And there is the art of hatching chickens and other fowls in ovens without the incubation of the females, which was discovered in Egypt, as Diodor-

* Page 146. of this vol.

us Siculus informs us*, and which, as he observes, must have multiplied very much the breed of fowls. This secret is known in Europe, and has been practised by way of curiosity, but, as travellers inform us, is still a common practice in Egypt.

Hitherto, the arts I have mentioned, invented in Egypt, are arts of use, some of them of the greatest use, such as agriculture and the other arts connected with it; others of them arts of convenience, and some of ornament merely. But I am now to proceed to speak of an art of absolute necessity in the civilized life, without which there could have been no civility, nor any arts invented worth mentioning. By this description the reader will understand, that I mean language; which, I say, was invented in Egypt, and formed into an art there, as well as the other arts I have mentioned. But, before I come to speak of it, I will mention another art, which is one of the finest of the liberal arts, being that which gives us the greatest pleasure, and which, if properly applied, may be made highly useful. The art I mean is music. This art, as I have shown, is so much connected with language, that there cannot be a perfect language, which is not more or less musical†; and, therefore, it is not improper to speak of the invention of it, before I come to speak of the invention of language.

That this art was practised in Egypt, and for a very good purpose,—the inspiring sentiments of devotion, as I have observed elsewhere‡, is a fact that cannot be disputed, being attested both by Herodotus and Plato. And Plato, in the passage I have quoted from him, says||, that it was employed for another excellent purpose, the

VOL. IV.

K k

forming

* Lib. 1. cap. 61.

† Page 117.

‡ See p. 167. and 168.

|| Ibid.

forming the manners of the youth. Now, as it was an art practised in Egypt, I say it was invented there, as well as the other arts I have mentioned. For Herodotus tells us, that they borrowed nothing from other countries; and, indeed, there was no other country in those antient times, from which they could have got any art such as that of music; which was an art of very antient practice in Egypt. And the invention of it goes back to their Dæmon Kings: For Plato tells us, that they had songs of Isis, which were 10,000 years old; and of this so antient music no alteration, he tells us, was permitted. It is evident, therefore, that as early as the days of Isis, music in Egypt must have been reduced to an art; and not practised, as we know it is in barbarous countries, without any art at all; for otherwise, I think, it could not have been preserved with so much accuracy. And, I think, it is highly probable, that they had a notation of music as well as we have; without which it could not well have been preserved so religiously (as we must suppose it was) in the memories and voices of men for such a prodigious number of years.

That men have naturally a perception of the difference of *acute* and *grave* in sounds, and that they can make that distinction by their own voices, is a fact which cannot be disputed. But I do not for that say, that men naturally sing, that is to say, compose acute and grave sounds together, so as to make what we call a *tune*; but this, I say, they learnt by imitation of birds, (man being, as Aristotle has told us, the most imitative of all animals, and particularly by the voice). And this was confirmed to me by the Wild Girl I saw in France, who told me that the people in her country learnt to sing in that way. But the practice in every art precedes the art: And therefore I am persuaded, that men sung a great while, in the way I have mentioned, before they had any art of music.

Before

Before such an art could be invented, the tune or song must first be analysed into its elementary notes; and then we must discover what the ratio is of those notes to one another; that is in other words, we must apply arithmetic and the doctrine of ratios to the different tones of the human voice, or of any instrument of music. To do this, and likewise to make the analysis, which must necessarily precede it, must appear, at first sight, a matter of great art and science. But even this is not all; for as the acute notes rise above the grave in an infinite progression, to which nature has set no bounds, in the same manner as numbers increase *in infinitum*, it was the business of science to set bounds to infinity in this as well as in other things. And this it has done by stopping at what is called the octave, (that is when the acute note is to the grave, as *two* to *one*, which is the first multiple ratio), and making it a new fundamental, and from it counting upwards as we did from the first fundamental, and so going on from one octave to another: In the same manner as in numeration we go on till we come to the decade, and there we stop, and reckon from it, as we did from unity, saying 10 and 1, 10 and 2, &c.; and so we go on till we come to another decade; and in this manner we reckon, proceeding, from decade to decade, to numbers, which we denominate by the names of hundreds, that is, ten decades; and then from hundreds to thousands, which are composed of ten hundreds; and so on. To explain such a progression at more length, in the matter of music, does not belong to a work of this kind. But, I think, I have said enough to show, that music could not be reduced to an art, and what is called a gamut, or scale of music, formed, except in a country such as Egypt, where there was a body of the best men of the nation set apart for the cultivation of arts and sciences, and where so many other arts and sciences were discovered.

The music of the Greeks, while they were yet barbarians, rose no higher than the music of the Hurons in North America, that is to a

fourth. And, I am persuaded, they knew not any more than the Hurons, what a fourth was, viz. that it was, with respect to the fundamental, in the ratio of *three* to *four*. It is a fact not disputed, that it was Pythagoras who taught them to raise their music to an octave; and, I cannot doubt of his having brought that discovery with him, as well as many others, from Egypt, where he was 22 years. At the same time, I am persuaded, that he gave them a scale of music, and taught them the ratios that the several notes bear to one another. And thus the Greeks learned the Diatonic scale of music, which, I am persuaded, was at first their only music; as I believe there was no other at any time known in Egypt. But the Greeks, though they got from Egypt not only the necessary arts of life, but the elements also of the liberal arts, such as painting and statuary, and of music among the rest, having, as I have elsewhere observed, a genius peculiarly suited to those arts, made refinements and improvements upon them, and particularly with respect to music; for they added to the Diatonic scale, by which the tone was only divided into two parts, or semitones, a scale, which they called *Chromatic*, by which the tone was divided into three parts; and, not stopping there, they added another they called the *Enharmonic*, by which the tone was divided into four parts. By these refinements, their music was no doubt more soft and delicate, and more proper for pleasing the delicate ear of the Greeks, but not so proper for the purposes to which the Egyptians applied their music—Devotion, and the instruction of youth. For these purposes the music must be such that it can be easily apprehended by the vulgar and even by children: Whereas the refinements, the Greeks made upon music, were such, that even those who had studied the art among them, denied, or at least doubted, that such a note, as the fourth part of a tone, could be executed by any voice or instrument, or could be perceived by the ear; and not content with these refinements upon the Egyptian music, they add-
ed

ed what they called *modes*, such as the Dorian, Phrygian, and Lydian.

Before I come to speak of the invention of language, I will mention another art, which has a much greater connection with language than music; for it is language itself, only in a different form, not being pronounced as language is. The art I mean is the writing art, which, though it was invented in order of time after language, yet, is so connected with that art, that I think it leads to the discovery of the invention of language. By language, as I have said, our ideas are made audible: But by the writing art they are made visible; not directly and immediately, but by the intervention of the sounds of the words which are marked by certain characters, that are perceived by the sight. As there must have been a progress in all the arts, the writing art began by making the ideas themselves an object of sight, directly and immediately, without the intervention of the sounds by which they are expressed. The first writing, therefore, was a kind of painting, whereby the subject of the idea was represented as it really existed. In this way the Mexicans wrote when the Spaniards first came among them; and I am persuaded this was the first writing in Egypt. But such writing could only represent corporeal objects, which had form and figure that could be painted; but could not represent things immaterial, such as the thoughts of men, their sentiments and passions. This could only be done by figurative, or symbolical representations of such things: And we are sure that this was practised in Egypt, as there are many remains of it in that country to be seen at this day; and it was used in sacred things even after the alphabetical writing was introduced, and from thence it was called hieroglyphical writing.

And here the reader may observe, how wonderfully our intellectual part is connected with our sensitive. From our senses all our knowledge

knowledge in this life is derived ; for they furnish the materials of which our ideas are composed. But, as of our ideas no art or science could have been formed without the communication of those ideas to one another, our senses have likewise furnished the means of that communication ; first by language, by which our ideas are made audible ; and secondly by writing, by which they are at first made visible by pictures and symbols ; and then by that wonderful art, by which the sounds of the words expressing the ideas, are made visible ; and so the ideas are conveyed, not only to the absent, at the greatest distance, but to the latest posterity, and with the ideas the language in which they are expressed. And in this way the progress of *man* in this life towards a better, has been wonderfully promoted ; and to this progress, as we have seen, both his intellect and his senses have concurred, and assisted one another.—But to return to the writing art.

That this wonderful art of alphabetical writing, by which not ideas only were made visible, which is the case of hieroglyphical writing, but, what is much more wonderful, the sounds by which ideas are expressed, were invented in Egypt, I think there can be no doubt, if Plato had not told us so in more than one place *. Before an alphabet could be invented, the language must have been analysed into its elemental sounds. Now, analysis is a great work of science, and indeed the foundation of all science ; so that this analysis could not have been made, but in a country where arts and sciences were cultivated, which, in those antient times, was only in Egypt. Plato, in the first passage above quoted, tells us, that an Egyptian, he calls Theuth, was the inventor of letters: But I believe it was of letters only ; for I am persuaded, that before his time, the art of language in Egypt was perfected, at least so far, that the words were analysed into their elemental sounds: For as no arts or sciences

* See vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 24. and 229.

res of any value, can be invented or cultivated without a language of art, I am persuaded, that such a language was a very early invention in Egypt, as early as their first race of Dæmon Kings, of which Theuth was not, but only of the second. And, I think, the answer which Plato has mentioned, that the Egyptian King made to Theuth, when he boasted that he had found out an art of memory, implies that he had only invented the characters, by which the elemental sounds were marked, not the elemental sounds themselves. For, says the King, you have not invented an art of memory, but of reminiscence *. Now, that could not apply to the discovery of the elemental sounds, but only to the notation of them in writing †. But supposing that Theuth had discovered nothing more, it was a wonderful discovery, as there could have been no writing art, without inventing marks for those elemental sounds. And of what wonderful use this invention was, we may judge, by comparing our writing with the Chinese. The Chinese, in order to express their ideas by writing, are obliged to make use of 80,000 figures of one kind or another; which to know and distinguish from one another, is the labour of the life of their learned men: Whereas we express all our ideas in writing by 24 letters or alphabetical characters, by which we not only communicate the ideas, but the sounds, that is the language, by which they are expressed; while the Chinese characters communicate only the ideas, but not the language; so that some nations in their neighbourhood use their written language, but know nothing of their oral.

CHAP.

* Vol. II. of Origin of Language, p. 24. and 25.

† See what I have said upon the difference betwixt the two discoveries, *ibid.* p. 256. and following.

C H A P. XIV.

Of the difficulty of the invention of Language.—The forming of Ideas, necessarily previous to the invention of Language; as there can be no Language, which has only names for individual things.—Of the difference betwixt Particular and General Ideas.—Abstract and General Ideas not the same.—Of the material part of Language, Articulation;—of wonderful difficult invention.—Nature has furnished the materials, with which other arts work; but we have created the materials of Language.—Wonderful, that we should have learned to articulate by any practice.—Speaking the most wonderful thing among Men.—As Men speak by imitation, they must have been taught to speak.—This could not be done by Men such as we, —but they must have had supernatural assistance, and been taught by Dæmons.—A Language of Art could not have been formed without Men having made some progress in other Arts and Sciences.—This could not be without some kind of Language being used before a Language of Art was formed.—The formal part of Language, a most wonderful part of the Art.—There must be words in a Language of Art, to express every thing in the World of Nature and the World of Art, Immaterial things as well as Material.—Each individual thing impossible to be expressed,—only the specieses of them can be expressed.—These so many, that they could not be all expressed by words unconnected with one another.—But they are connected together by the three great Arts of Language, Derivation, Composition, and Flexion.—Of these three, the greatest Art is Flexion.—An example of the Art of it in the Verb.—To a Language that is perfect is joined the pleasant Art of Music, consisting of Melody and

and Rhythm.—This common to several of the Antient Languages, and to some Modern Languages.—Of the difference betwixt the Music of the Chinese Language and that of the Greek.—The one is Chanting or Singing; the other a fine Melodious flow, suitable to Language, and quite different from common Music.—Language thus shewn to be a most beautiful as well as useful art, and of the greatest extent, variety, and, at the same time, regularity.

THE analysis of language into its elemental sounds, naturally leads me to speak of the invention of language itself; a most curious and wonderful art, as well as a most useful one, being the parent of all other arts and of all sciences, and, at the same time, of most difficult invention. Of the difficulty of the invention, I have said a good deal in the first chapter of this second book; but, I will add something more here, as language is the most important part of the subject of this book, which is the history of the invention of arts and sciences.

The invention of language is necessarily connected with another most important part of the history of man, so important, that without it, he could not have been a man at all, that is, an intellectual creature. What I mean is the Ideas of things, which he forms from the objects of sense; for, as I have more than once observed in the course of this work, our senses are the inlets of all our knowledge in this life. Ideas are so essential to language, that without them there could be no language at all; for a language, expressing only individual objects, could not be called a language. Of ideas, I have treated pretty fully in Chap. VI. and VII. of Book I. of this volume; where I hope I have satisfied the reader,—That there are particular ideas as well as general; nor, indeed, can general ideas without particular be conceived to exist;—That abstract ideas are diffe-

rent from general, though they be confounded by our modern philosophers;—And that an idea must be first abstracted from the particular object, in which it exists, before it can be generalized.

According to the method in which I have treated language, I have divided it into two parts; which I have considered separately, the *matter* and the *form*. The Matter of it is articulate sounds; and, in this respect, if in no other, it must appear to the philosopher the most wonderful of all arts: For in other arts, as I have elsewhere observed*, nature has furnished us with the materials, such as wood, stone, and metals; whereas, of language we have ourselves furnished the materials, that is, articulate sounds, which we may be said to have created. Of articulation I have spoken at considerable length in the chapter above referred to†; where I have shown how complicated an engine our vocal instrument is, by which we articulate; so complicated, that it is wonderful, that, by any teaching or practice, we should have learned the use of it, especially in syllables, where several elemental sounds are to be enunciated together; as in the word *strength* in English, in which there are no less than eight elemental sounds, and seven of them consonants‡. The material part of language therefore, I mean the pronunciation of it, I hold to be of such difficulty, that it never could have been invented without supernatural assistance; and, even after it was invented, it could not have been learned by practice, if Man had not been, as Aristotle says, the most imitative of all animals, and more imitative by the voice than in any other way. But, even imitative as he is, speaking, though the most common thing among men, is, as I have elsewhere observed||, one of the most wonderful.

That

* Page 108. of this vol.

† Chap. 1. of this book.—p. 109. and following.

‡ Page 115.

|| Page 121.

That men do not speak naturally, but must have learned it by teaching or imitation, is evident; and it is as evident, that they could not have taught themselves, any more than dumb men could teach themselves. They must, therefore, have been taught by others; but these others must have been first taught themselves. Now, who taught them, since they could not teach themselves? And, I say, it was not men such as they were, or such as we are, but superior intelligences, such as the Dæmon Kings of Egypt were. I hold it, therefore, to be certain, that the most barbarous languages, and the most defective and imperfect in their articulation, were not invented by the nations that speak them, nor by men such as we, but proceeded from superior intelligences. I have said, in other parts of my writings upon language, that men in certain countries may have heard such birds as the *curkoo* or *cocketoo*, to which the articulation of these sounds is natural, and may have imitated these sounds: This, however, is only possible. But it is not at all probable, that hearing those birds only at certain seasons of the year, and then only occasionally, men should have learned to have imitated these sounds; for it is only by hearing articulate sounds daily and constantly, that we learn to give such a position to our organs, and to put them in such an action, as to make us pronounce them. But if it were possible, I think it impossible, that out of such simple articulate sounds, as the names of those birds, any language, even the most imperfect in its articulation, could have been formed. What, therefore, I have all along supposed, in the course of what I have written upon language, that it could not have been invented by men, at least not without supernatural assistance, I hold to be certainly true. And this may suffice at present, with respect to the material part of language.

As to the *formal* part, I think it is evident, that a language of art, of which I am now to speak, could not have been formed except

in a country where arts and sciences had made considerable progress. Now, this could not have been without a language however imperfect: For, language is undoubtedly, as I have often said in the course of this work, the parent art of all other arts; as it is by it, that men have communication with one another, and, in that way, have invented arts. It is, therefore, I think evident, that men must have had a language, however imperfect, by which they were enabled to form a more perfect language. And, this first language, I think I have shown, must have been taught them by superior intelligences; and I also think it is very probable, that these same intelligences may have assisted them in the formation of a language of art.

The *formal* part of language considers words as significant. And here the art, when it passes from sounds to things, enlarges itself wonderfully, and is as extensive as our ideas; for a perfect language must express by words every thing, of which men living in civil society and cultivating arts and sciences, can have any idea. Now, these are all the things in the heavens above, on the earth below, and even the things under the earth and in the air or waters, which are perceived by our senses: And besides these natural objects, there are all the artificial works of men, which, in their intercourse in civil society, must likewise be expressed by words. So that language must comprehend the two worlds, of which I have spoken elsewhere*, the world of nature and the world of art. And not only must it express material things, but things immaterial, such as mind and the several kinds of it, the intellectual, animal, and vegetable, and their different qualities and operations. And at the same time that it expresses the *substances* of the several kinds I have mentioned, it must also express their *accidents*, and their relations and connections with one another. Now, to express each individual of such an infinity of things, by a distinct word, is a thing by nature impossible,

ble, at least for an animal of such limited capacity as man is. It is, therefore, only the specieses of things, that we can denote by words. How many of these are in number has not yet been ascertained: And all that science hitherto has been able to do in that matter, is to reduce them to genuses of the highest order, and in that way to class and number them; which, as I have shown*, was a very great work of science, the greatest perhaps that ever was performed. But, even as to the specieses, they are so many, that hitherto they have never been numbered, nor I believe ever will. The grammatical art, however, has reduced them to certain general heads, which it calls *parts of speech*, and has made them eight in number. These, I have observed, may be called the categories of language; and they admit of the same general division into substance and accident†. The specieses of things comprehended under the parts of speech, though they never have been numbered, we are sure, are so many, that, if they were to be all denoted by distinct words, unconnected with one another, there is no memory that could comprehend them, so as to make a ready use of them. It was, therefore, of absolute necessity that some way should be contrived, by which, in a language of art, the words used to express so very many different things, which in the Latin language amount to no less than five millions‡, should be so connected together, that they may be comprehended in the memory, and readily applied to use. This wonderful work is performed by the three great arts of language, Derivation, Composition, and Flexion, by which the words are so connected together, both in sound and sense, that the knowledge of one naturally leads to the knowledge of another. Of these three, flexion, as I have elsewhere observed||, is the greatest art; for without making a
new

* Page 76. of this vol.

† Page 118. *ibid.*

‡ Page 119. *ibid.*

|| Page 126. *ibid.*

new word, which is done by derivation and composition, it expresses by some small changes very many circumstances belonging to the thing expressed by the word, and which otherwise must have been expressed by different words. Of this great art of language the verb is a remarkable example; for, by certain changes of the word, it expresses *numbers, persons, times*, and besides all these, *the dispositions of the human mind with respect to the action of the verb**; and it also expresses whether the action be *done* or *suffered*. To express, by any flexion or change of the word, all the various subjects of the action of the verb, is by nature impossible. But the art of the Greek language has gone so far, (and I think it was impossible that it could go farther), as to express, in that way, the subject of the action, when it happens to be the same with the actor. This is done by what is called the *middle voice* in Greek †. In short, the verb in that language is so wonderful a piece of art, that I knew a Professor of Divinity who could not believe that it was the invention of man, but had come down from heaven ready made.

Flexion, too, in a language of art, is of the greatest use in that most important part of grammar, called *syntax*; and which is the completion of the grammatical art; being that, without which, the other parts of the art would signify nothing, as by it the words are so connected together as to make speech or discourse ‡.

But the art of a perfect language does not confine itself to articulate sounds, nor even to the variety of things expressed by those sounds; but it joins to the most useful art among men, the most pleasant art; I mean music. By this the reader will understand, that

* Page 119.

† See further concerning the wonderful variety of the flexion of the verb, p. 119.

‡ Page 119.—120.

that I mean melody and rhythm, such as that of the Greek language; of which I have spoken at great length in the second volume of the Origin of Language *. But it was not peculiar to the Greek language, but common to all the antient languages of art, such as the Latin, and a language much more antient than either the Greek or Latin; I mean the antient language of Egypt, which was carried to India, as I shall show in the sequel of this work, where it is still preserved in the Shanscrit language. It was also in the Hebrew language: And it found its way across the Atlantic to North America; where the savages, as we call them, at this day speak both with melody and rhythm †. The Chinese language is so much a musical language, that it is by musical tones chiefly that it distinguishes the significations of its monosyllables; so that, by words not exceeding 330 in number, it has contrived to express all the things belonging to a life of civility and art. But there is this material difference betwixt the music of the Chinese and of the Greek language, that the tones in the Chinese rise or fall above or below one another, at once, as in the common music, so that the intervals betwixt them are perceptible by the ear; which makes their speaking very much resemble chanting or singing: Whereas the melody of the Greek language proceeds by slides, rising in that way to a *fifth*, and descending in the same way to the common level of speech; which must have given to the pronunciation of that language a most beautiful flow, suitable to the nature of language, and distinguishing the music of it from common music. Besides these advantages, which the music of the Greek language has over the Chinese, it has rhythm and the distinction of long and short syllables, of which I could observe little or nothing in what I heard spoken of the Chinese:

* Book 2. chap. 4. 5. & 6.

† See upon the subject of the music of language, p. 117. and the passages there referred to.—As to the melody of the languages of America, see vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 132.

nese: And, I am sure, that their notes do not rise so high as a fifth; so that the intervals of so many different tones, by which they distinguish the signification of their monosyllables, must be very small, and make a music of little variety, and which cannot be performed, except by a very good voice, nor apprehended, except by a very nice ear. It appears, therefore, to be a language neither so pleasant, as the Greek, nor so fit for common use. And, *lastly*, the music of the Chinese language does not appear to be governed by any rules; whereas the melody of the Greek language is, as well as every thing else in that language, governed by rules, which are explained at great length by some Greek grammarians, particularly by Theodorus Gaza in his grammar.

Thus, I think, I have shown, that a language of art, such as the Greek, is not only a most useful, but a most beautiful art, and of the greatest extent and variety; comprehending all nature and art, and the immaterial as well as the material world, as far as the use of speech goes; and all digested in the greatest order, and with as much regularity as variety. And not only is a language of art the foundation of all other arts, and of all sciences, but it is intimately connected with another art, of the greatest importance in human life, being that, by which only a free government can be carried on: I mean the rhetorical art, of which the chief part is *action**,—the first, the second, and the third quality of an orator, according to the judgement of Demosthenes. Now, in action, the chief thing is the management of the voice in pronunciation, which must depend, first, upon a proper composition in sentences and periods, and then upon the pronunciation of these periods:—So that it is language which must give to oratory its greatest force and influence.

C H A P.

* See what I have said of Action, and of the several things comprehended under that word, in Origin of Language, vol. VI. p. 205. and following.

C H A P. XV.

Reasons for the Author insisting so much upon the difficulty of the invention of the Art of Language.—One reason is, that it tends to prove, that Language must have been invented in Egypt, where so many other arts were invented.—Proved, 1mo, That Language was invented by the Egyptians, by the progress they made in other arts and in sciences, which could not have been without Language.—2dly, Articulation could not have been invented without the assistance of those Daemon Kings, whom the Egyptians had.—3tio, We are sure that the Egyptians made the first step in the invention of an art of Language, by analysing it into its elemental sounds.—They did not stop at that analysis, but likewise analysed the words into the parts of speech.—But these words at first monosyllabical.—In this state Language went to China, where it remains unimproved, in its original state.—Hieroglyphics went there also;—and there they are still preserved.—In Egypt the art was perfected by the invention of the Alphabet, and of a Polysyllabical Language, formed by Derivation, Composition, and Flexion.—This completed the Grammatical Art, and the Art of Language.—The Phœnicians the only people that can contend with the Egyptians for the invention of Language.—Sundry reasons given why they were not the inventors of it.—1mo, Their Genius did not lead them that way, being wholly employed in Trade, and studious only of Gain.—2dly, They had no Polity fit for the invention or cultivation of arts.—3tio, They lived, in antient times, in the neighbourhood of the Egyptians, and so may be supposed to have got Language and other arts from them.—4to, They had their Religion from Egypt.—This proved by sun-

VOL. IV. M m dry

dry facts.—The Egyptians, therefore, the inventors, and the only inventors of Language.—How Language and other arts were transmitted from Egypt to other Countries, is an important part of the History of Man.—This to be treated of in the following Book.

IN the preceeding chapter, and other parts of this work, I have been at great pains to show the difficulty of the invention of language; and this for several reasons. *First*, it is an art of so common use, (much more common than any other art among men), and, in appearance of such easy use, being practised by men, women, and children, that some believe it to be natural to men, and among others a great writer, of whom I have made already a good deal of use, and shall make more in the sequel of this work;—Mon. Gebelin, author of the *Monde Primitif*, who believes that there existed a natural language among men, from which all the languages now spoken are derived.

My *second* reason is, That as language is the parent of all other arts, without which no other art or science could have been invented, and consequently man must have remained in his fallen state, that is an animal, with only the capacity of intellect, so that he could have made no progress in this life towards the recovery of his former state, it was proper that every thing concerning this art should be fully explained, particularly the difficulty of the invention of it; which I think I have shown to be so great, that it never could have been invented, if a wise and good God had not interposed to assist man in this first step of his progress.

My *third* reason is, that it tends to prove, what is to be the subject of this chapter, that the art must have been invented in Egypt, where so many other arts were invented, and particularly music, (an art, as I have

have shown, connected with language), which, though very much more natural to man than language, as Nature furnishes him the materials of which it is made, (and, therefore, it is practised by the most barbarous nations), was not formed into an art, except in Egypt, where a most curious analysis was made of it into notes, to which, as I have shown, numbers were applied in order to show the distinction of them, and their relation to one another. And another art was likewise invented in Egypt, which has still a closer connection with language; I mean the writing art, of the invention of which, I have treated in a preceding chapter*.

That in a country where so many other arts were invented, and these not so necessary as language, this most necessary of all arts, should have been invented, must appear at first sight highly probable. And if we consider, that the Egyptians, as Herodotus says, borrowed nothing from any other country, it is not only probable, but of absolute necessity, that they should have invented an art of language, without which, they could have invented no other art; for, as I have observed in more than one place, in the course of this work, it was only by the intercourse and communication with one another, which language affords, that men could have invented any other art.

But farther, I think I have shown, that the *matter* of language, I mean articulation, could not have been invented without supernatural assistance, which the Egyptians had from their Dæmon Kings. Now, without articulation no language can exist, not even the rudest and most inartificial. But it is farther proved, that the Egyptians made one great step in forming an art of language; and that was by analysing it into its elemental sounds, and so making an alphabet; which, though it be the first thing that our children are

M m 2

taught,

* Cap. 13. of this book.

taught, and therefore may be supposed to be as easily invented as taught, yet the contrary of this is proved to be the truth, by the example of barbarous nations, who have not studied language as an art; and though they have the ready use of it, both in conversation and public speaking, nevertheless, have not so much as the idea of an alphabet.

The Egyptians having gone so far in the invention of an art of language, as to have analysed the sound of it into its first elements, we cannot suppose that they would stop there, but would proceed to the analysis of the sounds considered as significant, that is, the words, and so discover what we call *the parts of speech*.

But even after that was done, the art of language was not complete; for there must be a progress in all the arts, and particularly in an art of so difficult invention as that of language; in the invention of which though supernatural assistance was given, yet it was necessary that things should proceed according to that order and regularity, by which every thing in this universe is conducted. In the natural order, therefore, of things, the first words, which men learned to articulate, were monosyllables; and it would be only in process of time, that they would learn to join monosyllables together, into words of several syllables. The first language, therefore, which was spoken in Egypt, was a monosyllabical language, which came to China through India, together with their hieroglyphical writing; and they are both preserved in China to this day*. But among the Egyptians, a people much more ingenious than the Chinese, an art of writing by alphabetical characters, was, as we have seen, invented, and also a polysyllabical language; the consequence of which last invention was the discovery and the practice of the three great arts of language, Derivation, Composition, and Flexion.

In

* See vol. VI. of *Origin of Language*, p. 141. and following, also p. 108.

In this way the grammatical art in Egypt was compleated; and the language by the labours of the colleges of Priests, men set apart for the invention and cultivation of arts, was brought to that perfection, in which we see it is in the Shanscrit, preserved still among the Priests of India, and which, as I shall show in the sequel, was the antient language of Egypt.

The only people I ever heard mentioned, that might have invented a language, as well as the Egyptians, are the Phœnicians; a very antient people undoubtedly, and who were very early possessed of arts and civility, and particularly of the art of navigation, by which they carried their commerce to very remote parts of the world. But, in the *first* place, the Phœnicians had no supernatural assistance by Dæmons, such as were among the Egyptians, without which, I think I have shown, it was impossible that men could have invented articulation.

2dly, I say that the genius of this people did not incline them to invent or cultivate arts and sciences; but that they were, as Diodorus informs us*, from the most antient times, studious of gain; for which purpose they applied themselves to trade, and were the greatest navigators of antient times. Among such a people, I think, it is impossible, that an art of more difficult invention than any other should have been discovered. And though they had a genius fitted for such an invention, they had no polity or constitution of government, like the Egyptian, suited for the invention and cultivation of arts.

3tio, They lived in antient times, as Herodotus informs us †, upon the Red Sea, in the neighbourhood of the Egyptians; so that what

* Lib. 5. cap. 38.

† Lib. 7. cap. 89.

what arts they had, they may have got from the Egyptians, and among others, the art of language. That they were intimately connected with the Egyptians, and had adopted many of their customs and manners, and particularly their religious customs, is evident from sundry facts recorded of them; particularly Porphyry tells us, in his book *De Abſtinentia* *, that they had the ſame veneration for the Cow that the Egyptians had, and would not on any account eat of her fleſh. 2dly, Herodotus informs us †, that the image which the Phœnicians had upon the prow of their galleys, and which they called *Παραϊνος*, was very like to the ſtatue of Vulcan in Egypt. Now, this ſo great reſemblance could not have been accidental; and the probability is, that they had taken from Egypt this tutelary god of their veſſels. 3dly, In Tyre, the capital of Phœnicia, there was, as Herodotus informs us, a temple of Hercules, as old as the city; that is, 2300 years old, in the days of Herodotus, and which, therefore, muſt have been of the Egyptian Hercules, as the ſame author rightly concludes; and in the ſame paſſage he tells us, that the Phœnicians built a temple to Hercules in Thafus, a colony of theirs, five generations before the ſon of Amphytrion‡. And, laſtly, we are told by Jamblichus, in his life of Pythagoras ||, that the Hierophants and Myſtagogues of Biblos and Tyre got all their religion and philoſophy from the Egyptians. It is, therefore, evident, that the Phœnicians had their religion and myſteries from Egypt; and if ſo, I think, we may conclude, that they had their language and other arts from the ſame country.

Thus I think I have ſhown, that language was invented in Egypt, and in no other country; for, if it was not invented by the Phœnicians,

* Lib. 2. cap. 11.

† Lib. 3.

‡ Lib. 2. cap. 44.

|| Cap. 3.

ans, as I think I have proved it was not; there was no other people at that time that could have invented it; for as to the Babylonians, and their Priests the Chaldæans, it is well known, to those who have studied antient history, that they were a colony of the Egyptians.

But it will be said, supposing the Egyptians were the inventors, and the only inventors of language, and that the antient Egyptian language was that primitive language, from which all the other languages of the world have been derived, how should this language have come from Egypt to all the other countries of the world? This is no doubt a matter which deserves mature consideration; and as the transmission of arts and sciences, and particularly of the parent art, language, from one country to another, is a very important part of the history of man, I intend it for the subject of another book, which will conclude the history I have undertaken to give, of arts and sciences.

BOOK

B O O K III.

Of the Transmiffion of Arts and Sciences from Egypt
to other Countries.

C H A P. I.

Egypt fo fituated as to be fit for communicating its Arts to many countries of the Earth.—It communicated by land with Africa and Asia.—In Africa their Arts do not appear to have made any great progress.—The Lybians quite a Savage People.—They spoke a very barbarous Language, which they may have formed from hearing the Egyptian Language spoken.—To Asia the Egyptian Language and Arts may have been carried by Sesostris, who overran even the northern parts of Asia, and established a colony at Colchis upon the Euxine Sea.—The Jews learned their Language from Egypt;—but it was a corrupt dialect of the Egyptian which they spoke.—This proved from what passed in Egypt when Jacob and his family came there.—They learned also the writing Art in Egypt, and wrote like the Egyptians from right to left.—From Chaldæa the Egyptian Language proceeded to other parts of Asia.—The Art of Language, though of more difficult invention than any other Art, is of very easy communication.—Of the progress of the Egyptian Arts from Egypt to Europe.—Sesostris, from Colchis, might have gone

gone by land to Thrace, where he was.—But the easier and shorter passage from Egypt to Europe was by Sea.—Of Navigation the Egyptians had the use in the earliest times.—The nearest Island in the Mediterranean Sea to Egypt was Crete.—Thither the Egyptian Arts first went, being introduced by the Idæi Dactyli and the Curetes.—That Religion came from Egypt to Crete, proved by the Samothracian and Eleusinian Mysteries, being well known there.—Saturn the first King of Crete, being dethroned by his Son Jupiter, carried from thence the Egyptian Arts to Italy, and made a Saturnian age there.—Jupiter ruled in Greece as well as in Crete,—introduced there the Egyptian Arts.—These Arts brought into Greece more directly by Colonies from Egypt.—The necessity of Migration from so small a Country as Egypt, and so populous.—Of the two Colonies which came from Egypt, and formed the nations of Athenians and Arcadians:—These the two most antient nations of Greece.—From Arcadia came a Colony under Oenotrus, that settled in Italy, and another under Evander.—From Arcadia came the Pelasgi, who introduced a great deal of Civility and Arts into Greece, particularly the Writing Art:—But the Egyptians carried their arts to a Country very remote, viz. India.—This the subject of another Chapter.

THE first thing to be considered, in this inquiry concerning the propagation of arts and sciences from Egypt into other countries, is the situation of Egypt with respect to these other countries. If it had been situated any where in the extremities of east or west, north or south, it could hardly be supposed that its arts should have made any great progress into other countries. But its situation was as favourable for that purpose as the other circumstances that I have mentioned; for it was so situated as to have an easy communication not only with Africa, a part of which it was, but with Asia and Europe. By land it had a communication with every part of Africa:

But it does not appear that the Egyptian arts made any great progress in that country; for the Lybians were in a savage state, as late as the time of the Jugurthine war, according to the account which Sallust the Roman historian gives of them. They had, however, the use of language; though no doubt a very imperfect language, resembling, as we are told, the cries of bats. But that they got it, even such as it was, from Egypt, I cannot doubt; for, I think, it is impossible, to suppose that a people, so barbarous as they, should have invented that artificial way of communication by articulate sounds. I therefore must suppose, that they learned from the Egyptians, or from some other nation who had themselves learned from the Egyptians, to distinguish and vary their animal cries by articulation, which when they had learned, they might form a kind of language themselves, very different to be sure from a language of art, but such as would serve the purposes of their savage life.

With Asia likewise they had an intercourse by land: For their King Sesostris overran all Asia, even the northern parts of it, where he left a colony, at Colchis, upon the northern part of the Euxine Sea; and we are told, that he also conquered the Scythians.

That in those remote countries of Asia Sesostris introduced some of the Egyptian arts, or that they came, from the colony he left at Colchis, to other parts of Asia, cannot, I think, be doubted: And, even before he overran all Asia, there is the greatest probability that some of those arts, and particularly language, had come to those countries of Asia nearest to Egypt, such as Syria, Chaldaea, and Palestine. The Jews are the only people in Asia, of those early times, of whom we have any account that can be depended on; and, I think, there is evidence, that they had learned their language from Egypt. When Abraham went to Egypt, we must suppose that he could make himself understood there: Nor could Joseph have

have been qualified to govern Egypt, or even the household of Potiphar, if he had not understood the Egyptian language. And, when Joseph's brethren went to Egypt, though Joseph spoke to them by an interpreter *, I think, it is evident, he did so, only to conceal himself; for they spoke to Joseph's steward without an interpreter †; and so did Jacob to Pharaoh ‡. At the same time, I am persuaded, that the Hebrew, which the family of Jacob then spoke, was a corrupt dialect of the language of Egypt; for we know what changes language suffers even in the same nation, and almost always for the worse. But when a language travels through several nations, as the Egyptian must have done before it reached Chaldæa or Canaan, it must have suffered great alterations and been much corrupted, not so much however as not to be understood by Pharaoh and the Egyptians; though Joseph, in order to conceal himself, got an interpreter, who spoke to his brethren in their own dialect. But, I hold it to have been impossible, that the family of Jacob, or any of his predecessors, living, as they did, a pastoral and nomade life, could have invented a language of art, such as the Hebrew was, though not of so great art as the Sanscrit or the Greek, or even could have learned to articulate their animal cries, or to invent a language the most rude and barbarous that can be imagined. That the Hebrews had learned the writing art in Egypt, or at least that Moses had learned it, is evident from what passed at Mount *Sinai*; and accordingly the Hebrews wrote, as the Egyptians did, from right to left, not, as we do, from left to right. And as they learned to write, so they learned to speak, from Egypt; nor, indeed, was there any other country where they could have learned it. In the same manner that the Egyptian language found its way to Chaldæa, I am persuaded,

N n 2

* Genesis, chap. 42. v. 23.

† Ibid. chap. 43. v. 19.

‡ Ibid. chap. 47. v. 8.

suaded, it travelled over a great part of Asia: For, though language be an art of more difficult invention than any other, it is of easier communication, as we may know by our own children, who, at the age of two or three, learn to speak by mere imitation without any teaching: Though we need not suppose, that those nations of Asia learned the Egyptian language so perfectly as our children learn our language; but, that hearing the Egyptian language spoken, they got some words of it, and having thus learned to articulate, they formed a language of their own, as I have said the Lybians did.

As to Europe, there was nothing to hinder the Egyptian arts from travelling by land from Colchis to Europe; and, besides, Sesostris, as I have observed*, carried his arms as far into Europe as Thrace. But the easier and shorter communication with Europe was by sea; and as the Egyptians had, in the earliest times, the use of navigation, we cannot doubt that they went to Europe in that way, and first to the Island of Crete, which is the part of Europe lying the nearest to Egypt. From this country it is certain, that the Greeks got their religion, civility, and arts. These were introduced into Crete by two races of men, the *Idæi Daetyli*, and the *Curetes*. But where did they learn them? I think it could have been no where else than in Egypt; for what other country was there then of civility and arts. And what, I think, is proof positive, that those two races of men got religion as well as arts from Egypt, is what *Diodorus Siculus* tells us, that the *Samothracian* and *Eleusinian* mysteries were perfectly well known in Crete, and communicated, to those who desired them, freely, and not under any obligation of secrecy. Now, that those mysteries came to Greece from Egypt is not doubted; and, indeed, from what other country in the world, at that time, could religious mysteries have come? Saturn was the first who appears to have established a kingdom in Crete, of which he himself was the
sovereign;

* Page 239. of this vol.

sovereign; and, under him, the Cretans enjoyed that happiness, which men enjoyed in the first ages of civility, before vices and crimes,

Et belli rabies et amor successit habendi.*

And from Saturn this happy age was called the Saturnian age, and by him was carried to Italy, where he introduced the Egyptian civility and arts; for he was dethroned and expelled from Crete by his son Jupiter, and took refuge in a part of Italy, which, from giving shelter and concealment to him, was called *Latium*. His son Jupiter extended his dominions to Greece, and became a King and a great God there. * The Greeks, at that time, appear to have been in a state altogether barbarous, and no better than wild beasts, and worse than wild beasts in one respect, that they ate one another†. Jupiter, therefore, by introducing civility and arts among them, may be said to have made men of them; for which reason, he was intitled *the father both of gods and men*. But of the Greek gods, and the Cretan traditions concerning them, I have said a great deal more in a dissertation upon the Antient History of Greece, which I have subjoined by way of appendix to this volume.

If there were any doubt of religion, civility, and arts, having come from Egypt to Greece by the way of Crete, the colonies, which from Egypt came to Greece, must prove, I think incontestibly, that the Greeks got civility and arts, not only by the way of Crete, but directly and immediately from Egypt. The Egyptians, living in such a happy climate, in so fruitful a country, and under so excellent a form of government, must, as I have shown, have multiplied exceedingly; being free of those vices and diseases, and particularly

* Virgil. *Æneid*. 8. v. 327.

† See upon this subject what I have said on p. 95. and 139. of this vol.

particularly of pestilential diseases, which, at different times, have gone near to depopulate many countries. As Egypt was, therefore, but a small country, no more than a valley betwixt the Arabian mountains on one side, and the Lybian on the other, in some parts not above 200 stadia broad, that is, about 25 English miles*, it was of absolute necessity that the country should be overstocked with people in the course of so many ages, and, therefore, that it should discharge itself, by sending colonies to different parts of the world. Of these, Diodorus Siculus tells us, that many were recorded in their sacred books; but, of which, Diodorus appears to have doubted. But, for my part, I see no good reason for rejecting the authority of those books in any thing, but particularly in this matter of colonies, which, I think, it was of absolute necessity, that the Egyptians should have sent out of their country. Now, two of these colonies were sent to Greece in very ancient times, and formed the two most antient nations of Greece, the Athenians, who boasted that they were *αυτοχθονες*, or *produced out of their soil*, and the Arcadians, who pretended to be older than the moon, *Προτελληνοι*, as they called themselves†. From this last mentioned country, came a colony, under CEnotrus, to Latium in Italy, 17 generations, as the Halicarnassian tells us, before the Trojan war; and, at a latter period, another, from the same country, came under Evander, and occupied that very ground upon which the city of Rome was built: So that here we have civility and arts again imported from Egypt into Italy. From the same country of Arcadia came originally the Pelasgi, who were a very wandering people; for they went not only from Egypt to Greece, but to Asia, where they were, as Homer informs us, at the time of the Trojan war, and also to Italy. They

* Herodot. Lib. 2. cap. 8.

† These two colonies, from Egypt to Greece, I have mentioned in vol. 3. of *Origin of Language*, p. 301. and I have spoken of them, at great length, in the first vol. of that work, from p. 638. to p. 646. of 2d edition.

They are said to have civilised Greece, more than any other people*: And, among other Egyptian arts, they introduced into Greece the use of those antient letters, which from them were called Pelasgic, and were used by the Greeks before they got an alphabet from Cadmus, which they used in latter times. But, of these migrations from Arcadia I have treated at great length in the appendix above referred to. I will, therefore, in the next chapter, proceed to treat of a migration of the Egyptian arts to a country very much more distant than any I have mentioned, I mean India, and which, if it be true, must put an end to every doubt, of the Egyptians having carried civility and arts to the other countries I have mentioned.

CHAP.

* See vol. 1. of Origin of Language p. 636. of 2d edition.

C H A P. II.

The similarity of Polity, Customs, and Manners, between nations so remote as Egypt and India, wonderful, and without example,—not to be found even in nations contiguous.—The first resemblance is, in a thing singular to both nations,—viz. the division of the people into classes, according to their several occupations.—This division in India, more accurate and minute than in Egypt.—Another singularity in which the two nations agree is, the veneration of the Cow.—Of the division of Time into Months and Years;—the same in India as it was in Egypt, and is among us.—The division into Weeks not necessary for any purposes of life, yet observed both in India and Egypt.—The days also consecrated to the same planets and in the same order.—The conformity betwixt the two nations, as to the signs of the Zodiac, most extraordinary.—Of the Religion of India.—The same distinction made there, betwixt the Popular Religion of the country and the Religion of Philosophers.—The fall of man maintained by the Indians, and a future state of rewards and punishments,—also the doctrine of the transmigration of minds, which came originally from Egypt.—The diet and manner of life of the Indians, the same as in antient Egypt.—They eat no flesh, but of the beasts which they sacrifice.—They drink no wine or strong liquors; and neither did the Egyptians in very antient times.—The same regard for the animal life in India as in Egypt.—The killing of some animals was a capital crime in Egypt, and is so in India.—There a mulct is imposed for the killing of any animal, even Tygers.—A resemblance betwixt the two nations also in their festivals, and exhibitions on those occasions.

THE

THE similarity of Polity, Customs, Manners, and Opinions, in two countries so remote from one another as Egypt and India, is so great, as not to be paralleled on this earth; and not only in nations so distant from one another, but not even, I believe, in nations the nearest to one another. The first similarity, I shall observe, is a singularity in the constitution of the two nations, such as is not, nor ever was, in any other nation; I mean the division of the people into different classes, or *Casts* as the Indians call them, consisting of men of different occupations, who live entirely separated from one another, and do not mix by intermarriages. Of these classes, in Egypt, I have already treated in page 209, and following, of this volume; where I have followed the division, which Diodorus Siculus has given of them, into *five*, the Priests, Soldiers, Husbandmen, Shepherds, and Handicraftsmen. Brassey Halhed in his Translation of the Code of Gentoo Laws, which, by the orders of the East India Company, was compiled by eleven Bramins, and written originally in the Shanscrit language, makes the number of Casts in India to be no more than four: The first is the Bramins, answering exactly to the Priests of Egypt; and, therefore, they are said to be the wisdom of the nation. The military men, or Rajaput race, as they are called, compose the second class; and so far the division of men in India corresponds exactly with the division in Egypt: The third class in India is more comprehensive than the same class in Egypt; for it comprehends not only the husbandmen, but the shepherds, and also those who deal in trade. The fourth class is composed of the meanest of the people, or Souders, as they call them, who practice mechanic arts, and are by Nature destined to serve and to labour*. But these four classes are subdivided into different casts, of which, I have been told, there are above 80 †: So that the division of the

VOL. IV. O o people

* See Mr Halhed's Preface to his Translation, p. 49.

† This information I had from the late Mr Frazer, who wrote the life of Kouli Chan.

people in India appears to be more accurate and minute than it was even in Egypt.

Another singularity, in which the two nations agreed, is the veneration of the Cow, which is universal all over India. Of this Mr Holwell has treated very fully, in his book upon India*; and has given some very good reasons, why the Indians should have such a respect for that animal. How much the Cow was revered in Egypt, is very well known; but in no other country, antient or modern, except Egypt and India, there neither is, nor ever was, any extraordinary respect paid to that animal. So here is another singularity in which the two nations agree, but differ from every other nation antient or modern.

A third thing in which the two nations agree, is a matter of great consequence in the civilised life—the division of time into years and months. In India the division, into years and months, is the same as with us; and which, as I have shown†, came originally from Egypt to the Romans, and from them to us. But there is a third division of time, not so necessary as the two I have mentioned, but which is observed in India at this day; I mean the division into weeks. This, too, came originally from Egypt, but was not known, till later times, to the Greeks and Romans, as Dion Cassius informs us; and what is most remarkable is, that the several days of the week are consecrated to the same planets, and in the same order as it was among the Egyptians, and is among us; for that it was so among the Egyptians, we cannot doubt, as Herodotus tells us, that among them every day was consecrated to some God. In India, therefore, the first day of the week is dedicated to the Sun—the second to the Moon—the third to Mars—the fourth to Mercury—the fifth to Jupiter—the sixth to Venus—and the seventh to Saturn,

just

* Page 73.

† Page 147. of this vol.

just as it was among the Romans, and is among us. Now, such a division of time, not necessary for distinguishing seasons, or for any purpose of civil life, could not by accident have been adopted by two nations, and much less the consecration of the days to the same planets and in the same order*.

Another thing, which I think still more remarkable, is, that the Indians divide and distinguish the several regions of the Heavens, through which the sun passeth in the course of a year, by fixed stars, conceived to represent certain things here upon earth. These representations are well known by the names of the signs of the zodiac; and, as they are altogether fanciful and imaginary, it is impossible they could have been hit upon by two nations that had no communication together. Yet, it is as certain, that the signs of the zodiac came from Egypt to Greece, and from thence to us, as that they are to be found at this day in certain Pagodas in India.

As to the religion of India, Mr Holwell, who was 30 years in India, and was President for some time of the English Court of Law at Calcutta, and is a man of learning as well as law, and from whom we have learned many curious particulars concerning India, has given us a very full account of it; from which it appears, that the Indians make the same distinction, which the Egyptians made†, betwixt the religion of the philosophers and the religion of the people. The Bra- mins, like the Egyptian Priests, are the ministers of the popular religion, and, at the same time, are their philosophers; and it is from them, no doubt, that Mr Holwell has taken his account of the philosophical religion of India. He says, that in their sacred book, which he calls

O O 2

their

* See what Mr Halhed has said upon this subject, in his Translation of the Code of Gentoo Laws, p. 41. See also what Mr Holwell, in his book upon India, has said upon the same subject, p. 117, and seq.

† See p. 165. of this vol.

their *Sbasta*, the Unity of God is maintained; at the same time they believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, as well as the Egyptian Priests did, from whom Plato no doubt learned it: And the Indians have a type of the Trinity, which I do not think improper. It is a triangle inscribed in a circle *, where we have represented the *three* in *one*, and the *one* in *three*. They maintain also the Providence of God, and his Government of the world, by inferior spirits, particularly by one spirit, whom they call *Brama*, from whom, he says, the Bra- mins have their name. In this book is also maintained the free will of Man, and his abuse of that free will by his rebellion against God, which produced his fall, as well as that of the Angels, from a happy state to the state he is in at present; and this fall of man is also a doctrine of Plato, and which, I am persuaded, he likewise learned in Egypt. To his prior happy state, he cannot be restored without going through several stages of purgation and purification: So that here we have, laid down, both a pre-existent state of Man, and a future state of rewards and punishments. In his state of purgation Man passes through the body of several other animals, till he comes into the body of a cow †; and from thence he passes again into the body of a man. Now, this doctrine of *Metempsychosis*, or *Transmigration*, was an Egyptian doctrine, as Herodotus informs us, and came from Egypt to Greece, where it was adopted by some philosophers, particularly by Plato. And there is one thing of their popular religion, which they have also taken from Egypt; and that is the *Phallos*, which, as Herodotus tells us, was worshipped and carried about in processions in Egypt: And the same adoration is paid to it at this day in the kingdom of Bengal ‡; and I have no doubt, but, by the wise men of both countries, it has been considered as a type or symbol

* La Croze's Christianity of India, p. 294.

† Holwell, p. 50.—51. See also Dow's History of India concerning Transmigration, p. 43.

‡ See Dow's History of India.

symbol of the creative or productive power of the divinity. And this is likewise a singularity in the religion of the two countries; for there is no other nation that either has, or ever had, such an object of worship, except the Greeks, who certainly got that, as well as the rest of their religion, from the Egyptians.

Further, the whole diet and manner of life of the Indians appears to be Egyptian; for they live upon vegetables, and kill no beasts in order to eat them, but only for sacrifice, which was the practice in Egypt. But, when they sacrifice, they eat of the victim, as the Egyptians did, and as the Bramins do at this day in India, according to the information I have from Mr Wilkins. As they do not eat flesh, except, as I have said, when they sacrifice, neither do they drink any wine or strong liquor of any kind: And, I think, it is probable, that the same was the practice of the Egyptians, when they imported civility and arts into India; though, in later times, they altered their manner of life in this respect, and drank both wine and beer.

They have the same regard for the animal life that the Egyptians had. Among the Egyptians all animals, tame or wild, were sacred in one district or another: And where they were sacred, it was a capital crime to kill any of them willingly; but to kill the *Ibis*, or hawk, willingly or unwillingly, was capital*: And, in like manner, I am persuaded, the killing of a cow, the most sacred of all the animals among them, and sacred in every part of Egypt, was capitally punished, though I do not remember that it is mentioned in any author. Among the Indians the killing of a cow is a capital crime; and the killing of any animal tame or wild, even a tyger or a bear, is punishable by a fine†: And I have heard one proof of their

* Herod. Lib. 2. cap. 65.

† Code of Gentoo Laws, p. 205. and 238.

their regard for the animal life, which I could not have believed, if it had not been attested by more than one gentleman who have been in India. They told me, that, in the town of Bombay, the Hindoos had so much concern about the maintainance of what we think a vile and contemptible insect, and which is very troublesome to us, I mean the bug, that they hire people to allow themselves to be fed upon in the night time by that animal. To feed, in this way, with the blood of our own bodies, so mean an insect, is carrying our regard for the animal life much too far: But we in Europe go to the other extreme, and abuse very much that dominion which God has given us over the animals of this earth, treating even the noblest of them, such as the horse, who is of more use and ornament to us than any other, very often in the worst manner*.

And not only in their religion, government, and manner of life, is there such a conformity with the Egyptians, but also in their pleasures; for, in their festivals, they have dramatical representations of their religious mysteries, such as they Egyptians had in what they called their *δαιτυλῆ* †.

CHAP.

* Holwell, p. 147.

† Ibid. p. 145.

C H A P. III.

*The conformity in so many particulars, betwixt Egypt and India, could not have been by accident,—nor could each of these nations have been the original inventors.—The one must have copied from the other.—The question then, which was the original, which the copy?—No third nation, from which those two nations could have taken their institutions and customs,—such a conformity could not have been produced in the ordinary way of commerce.—The two nations, therefore, must have mixed and lived together for some time.—The Indians did not go to Egypt.—Therefore the Egyptians came to India.—This proved not by argument only, but by facts;—a particular account given by Diodorus of the expedition to India by Osiris,—also of that of Sesostris to the same country.—Both these expeditions by land.—But Sesostris was not the first Egyptian King that went to India.—This attested not only by the sacred books of the Egyptians, but by a tradition preserved among the most learned of the Indians.—In that tradition a memorable story preserved, of Osiris having saved his army from a pestilential disease by carrying it to a hill called Mngos.—Hence the Greek fable.—Summary of the evidence of Osiris having gone to India.—Objection to the account of Osiris's expedition, that Herodotus says nothing of it.—This answered.—The tradition also mentions that Hercules was in India, and clothes and arms him very properly.—The absurdity of the Greek fable, concerning the cloathing and armour of Hercules.—Memorials of Osiris in India, to be seen in the days of Alexander, and even of Diodorus Siculus.—Strabo did not believe in the expedition of Osiris.—A reason given for that.—The Egyptians could
not*

not go to India to learn civility and arts;—these they must have had before,—and the Indians must have learned them from them.—This proved by monuments of black men, with woolly hair, to be seen in India; and also in China and Japan.—Proof that the Egyptian Religion, as well as arts, was carried to all the countries of the East as well as to India.—Language also carried from Egypt to India,—a language of art, the work of science and philosophy; in which analysis is very much practised.

FROM what has been said in the preceding chapter it is evident, that the wonderful conformity betwixt the Egyptian and Indian Polity, Customs, Manners, and Opinions, could not have happened by accident; and, I think, it is equally certain, that each of the nations could not have been the original inventors of those things, (some of them singular and unknown to all other nations), but that the one of them must have copied them from the other: So that the only question is, Which is the copy, and which the original?

Another thing, I think, is also certain, that there was no third nation upon the face of the earth, from which they could have taken those singular institutions and customs. And it likewise appears to me to be equally certain, that such a perfect similitude in all those things I have mentioned, could not have arisen from any trade or commerce betwixt the two nations. For, in the *first* place, we know that the Egyptians carried on no trade with any nation: And, *2dly*, such trade or commerce never could have produced so entire a conformity of things, so essential to the constitution and government of every country, as those I have mentioned; but there must have been a communication between the two nations more intimate than any trade could produce;—In short, the two nations must have mixed and lived some time together in the same country. Now, the
Indians

Indians certainly did not come to Egypt; and, if so, the Egyptians must have gone to India, and made settlements in that country. If, therefore, there was no other evidence of the Egyptians having been in India in very antient times, this alone, which arises from the nature of the thing, would be sufficient to convince me.

But the matter does not rest upon argument only; for Diodorus Siculus has given us a very particular account, from the Egyptian sacred books, no doubt, which he says, he studied very dilligently, of the expedition of Osiris, one of the last race of their Dæmon or God Kings, as they called them, into India, with a great army; and this expedition he made, he says, by land, through Arabia, along the coast of the Arabian Gulph, or Red Sea, as we call it*. For it does not appear, that, so early as the days of Osiris, the Egyptians had what could be called a fleet, though they certainly had the use of navigation in the earliest times; for, otherwise, they could not have lived in a country where there was such a river, which once a year overflowed the whole country. But, under Sesostris, they had a fleet of 400 ships; and, yet, he likewise made the expedition by land into India, where he went farther than, it appears, Osiris did; for he crossed the Ganges, and overran the country as far as the Ocean†. Now Sesostris, according to Herodotus's calculation, which the Priests gave him from their books, was the 332d human King, counting from Menes, the first human King‡. Now, this must be allowed to be the historical period of the Egyptian history, not the mythological or fabulous, as some may think it. And, if so, it must be also allowed, that the Egyptians were in India at some time or another, unless we have a mind to reject the whole history of Egypt as fabulous.

VOL. IV.

P p

But

* Diod. lib. cap. 19.

† Ibid. cap. 55.

‡ Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 79.

But Sefoftris, as I have said, was not the first who went with an army from Egypt to India. He only followed the way, which Ofiris had led to that country: For Ofiris's expedition was not only recorded in the books of the Priests of Egypt, but the memory of it was preserved by tradition in India; and a tradition not among the vulgar, says Diodorus, but among the most learned of the Indians. According to this tradition, Dionysius, that is Ofiris, in the most antient times, came from the West with a great army into India, introduced civility and arts, and particularly agriculture, and taught them also religion. Before he came, the Indians lived in villages; but Dionysius built for them great and magnificent towns. He reigned in India 52 years; after which the Indian traditions made him die in India*.

In the account Diodorus gives of this tradition, he relates a memorable story preserved by it; and which, I think, very much confirms the truth of the tradition. The army of Dionysius was afflicted by a pestilential disease, the effect of the extraordinary heat of the season. The remedy which the wisdom of the leader of this army, says Diodorus, devised for this disease, was to carry it up to a hill called *Μηρος*, signifying in Greek, and, as it appears, likewise, in the Indian language, *a Thigh*; where, by the cool air, and the use of pure water immediately from the springs, the army was recovered. From hence, he says, the Greeks formed the fable of Dionysius, being inclosed and nourished in the thigh of Jupiter; and thus a true fact may be said to be attested by a fable. Here, therefore, we have the truth of this expedition of Ofiris from Egypt to a country so distant as India, and in the most antient times, attested not only by a written record in the one country, but by a constant tradition preserved among the most learned in the other country.

* Diod. lib. 2. cap. 38.

country. Now, if this be not proof of a fact, I desire to know how any fact of antient history can be proved.

The learned reader may object, that Herodotus, who certainly was very well informed of the history of Egypt, and has given us, as far as he has gone, a most accurate and distinct account of it, has not said a word of the expedition of Osiris into India, the most memorable event of that history. But it is to be observed, that he has said nothing of the actions or sufferings of any of the Dæmon Kings, though, I am persuaded, he knew more of it than Diodorus, or any author who has written of Egypt. But what he knew, he had learned from the Priests under the seal of secrecy, in the same manner as the Eleusinian mysteries, in Greece, were communicated to the initiated. Among other things, it is plain that he knew where some of them were buried; but this he thought it was unlawful to reveal*. From thence, I think, it appears, that the Priests wanted that the vulgar should believe their Dæmon Kings to be truly what they called them, *Gods*, that is, immortal. All, therefore, we learn from Herodotus of the Egyptian Gods is, that there were three races of them, of the last of which, he says, Osiris was one; and, he tells us, further, that the Greeks borrowed the names and adventures of the Egyptian Gods, and ascribed them to men of their own country.

Hercules, too, the Indian traditions said, had been in India; and they dressed him very properly in a lion's skin, (skins being the first cloathing among men), and armed him with a club, which was the first weapon used by men, and is at this day used by the Ourang-Outang. This was a very proper dress and armour for a man who lived in times so very antient; (for he was one of the second race of the Egyptian Gods consisting of twelve); but it was most absurd

P p 2

* *Ταῦτα μὲν ἱστορικὴ κίβδη*, is the expression he uses.

in the Greeks, to cloath and arm, in that way, the son of Amphytrion, who lived only a generation before the Trojan war. This Egyptian Hercules, Diodorus says, begot many children, among whom he divided India; and their race continued to reign there for many generations, some of them down to the time of Alexander. He also built several cities, of which he names one, that he calls Palibothra, a great, he says, and populous city *.

If there could be any doubt of the Egyptians having been in India, notwithstanding the records in one country, and the traditions in the other, and the demonstration which I think arises from the nature of the thing, it must be entirely removed by monuments which were to be seen in India, as late as the days of Diodorus Siculus; who tells us, that, among other towns that Osiris built in India, there was one which he called Nyssa, the name of the town in Arabia where he was nursed. In the ground, about this Indian town, he planted the Ivy, a plant that was consecrated to him; and our author says, that in no other part of India it is found. He adds, that he left so many monuments in India, that the Indians of later times claimed him as their countryman †.

I will add to the testimony of Diodorus, that of another historian who had an opportunity of being very much better informed concerning the expeditions of Osiris and Hercules into India, than Diodorus or any other author who has written upon the subject. The author I mean is Arrian, very valuable both for matter and stile, and well deserving the eulogium which Photius has bestowed on him ‡. He has written a book upon India, and is an author of the greatest authority, with respect to Indian affairs, of any antient author

* Diod. lib. 2. cap. 38.

† Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 19.

‡ See the end of his *Eclogæ* from Arrian's History of Alexander.

thor that is come down to us: For he has given us an account of that country from Megasthenes, who was in India when Alexander was there, and who travelled through more of the country than any other of those who accompanied Alexander in that expedition *; and also from Nearchus, who commanded Alexander's fleet that sailed from the mouth of the Indus to Babylon, and who, as Arrian tells us, wrote a History of Alexander †. Megasthenes had an opportunity of being better informed of the history and antiquities of India, than any other that was with Alexander; for he was with Sandracottus, a great Indian King, and with Porus, who was still a greater King ‡. What, therefore, he relates of the history of India is, I think, more credible than any thing we have from any other author; and Strabo, though he disbelieves many of the wonderful stories, he tells, of the strange animals in India, says nothing against his history of the men of that country. Arrian must also have got a great deal of information concerning India from what Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, who was afterwards King of Egypt, and Aristobulus, who, as well as Ptolmey, accompanied Alexander in his Indian expedition, wrote upon the subject of that expedition: And, accordingly, he has mentioned several curious particulars, concerning Indian towns which Alexander took, and Kings that he conquered; which he must have learned from those two authors ||. This author, so well informed, speaks of the expeditions of the Egyptians under Osiris and Hercules, as a fact of which there could be no doubt; and mentions many monuments of Osiris, that were to be found in India when Alexander was there: And, particularly, he tells the same story, which Diodorus tells, of his building the town of Nyssa; to which he adds his planting the Ivy there, a plant to be found in no other part of

* Arrian's Indica, p. 201. 203. and 318. Edit. Gronovii.

† Arrian, Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

|| Arrian's Expedition of Alexander, lib. 6. cap. 3. & 14. Also Indica, cap. 7. &c.

of India *. He mentions also his having taught the Indians the use of *Tympana* and *Cymbala* in their battles, and of cloaths of various colours, such as were used by the Bacchinals in the rites of Bacchus †. And he mentions a circumstance related by the Indians concerning the expedition of Ofiris, in which it differed from Alexander's expedition, namely, that Ofiris had no ships with him ‡, but made the journey, as Diodorus has related, by land: Whereas, Alexander had a fleet with him, commanded, as I have said, by Nearchus.

It was certainly from the two Kings, I have mentioned, Sandracottus and Porus, that Megasthenes learned the chronology of India, which Arrian gives us in his ninth chapter; where he tells us, that from Bacchus there were 153 Kings, whose reigns amounted to 6042 years, which makes $39\frac{1}{2}$ years to each King, one with another. From the same King he must have learned, that Bacchus, when he departed from India, left one of his companions, Spartembas by name, the most skilled in his rites, to govern the Indians, who reigned 25 years, and was succeeded by his son Boudyas ||. And there is at this day a tribe of Indians called Afghans, and once a very powerful tribe, who are recorded by an antient historian of good authority to have been an Egyptian colony §: And, I think, it is very

* Page 340. and 436.

† Page 559.

‡ Page 411.

|| Indica, cap. 8.

§ This account of the Afghans is given us by an antient Indian Historian, of the name of *Muttelu ul Anwar*, who is quoted as an author of good authority by another Indian Historian of the name of Ferishta, who lived in the beginning of the 17th century, and of whom Mr Dow has given us a translation, (See Dow's History of Indostan, vol. 1. p. 37); and, I think, it is a History very well worth translating.—There is a History of the same people, translated from the Indian language and presented to the

Literary

very likely, that Osiris or Sesostris would leave a colony of their troops in India, (as Sesostris certainly did at Colchis,) in order to ease themselves of their superfluous numbers.

Thus I think I have proved, as much as any fact of antient history can be proved, that the Egyptians were in India in very antient times. Nor should I have been at so great pains to prove, what, from the nature of the thing, I think, is evident, if so great an author as Strabo, had not treated, as a fable, the expeditions of Bacchus and Hercules into India. But he does not appear, to me, to have distinguished betwixt the Egyptian Bacchus and Hercules, and the Grecian: And, therefore, it is no wonder, that he treats, as fabulous, these expeditions of Bacchus and Hercules*. But, he gives neither arguments nor authorities in support of his opinion; and he acknowledges, that Megasthenes, who, as I have said, accompanied Alexander to India, was of another opinion; and he adds, what I think is not mentioned by Arrian, that Megasthenes related, that Bacchus was worshipped, even by the philosophers of India, in the mountains, and Hercules in the Plains†. Neither do I think that his opinion of the Egyptians never having been in India, is consistent with what he relates of the burial place of the Egyptian Kings,

Literary Society of India by Henry Vausittart. This translation Sir William Jones has given us in his *Asiatic Researches*, vol. 2. p. 69. According to the account of this author, the Afghans are a colony of Jews, which settled in India. Who the author was, and when he lived, who tells this story, we are not informed: But whoever was the author of it, I think very little credit is to be given to it. It is confessed by the Gentleman, who presented it to the Society, (p. 67. *ibid.*) that the beginning of it is entirely fabulous; and the rest of it, in my judgment, is of very little value.—The ground work of what remains of it, is the History of the Old Testament, contained in the two books of Samuel; but with many additional circumstances, which, I am persuaded, are fabulous.

* Strabo, p. 505.

† *Ibid.* lib. 15.

Kings, near to Thebes, where 40 of them were interred, with obelisks near their sepulchres, and inscriptions on these obelisks, which mentioned their power, their wealth, their armies amounting to a million of men, and their empire extending over Scythia, Bactriana, and India*. This Egyptian monument, he appears to have himself seen. Now, though we should give no faith to the sacred books of the Egyptians, nor to the traditions preserved among the learned in India, agreeing with those books, if we will not be convinced by the inscriptions upon those monuments, more antient, it is likely, than even the books of the Priests, I think we must give no faith to old monuments of any kind.

Having thus proved by the testimonies of antient authors, which I think unquestionable, that the Egyptians were in India in very antient times, it does not appear to me necessary to add any authorities from modern authors. I will, however, quote one modern author, *M. la Croze*, who has written, in French, a very good book upon India, which he entitles *the History of the Christianity of the Indies*. In the second volume of this work†, he asserts the fact, as a thing that could not be doubted: And he says, that the Jesuit *Father Catrou*, in his *History of the Mogul Empire*, and *M. Huet*, Bishop of Avranches, in his *History of the Commerce and Navigation of the Antients*, are of the same opinion. And, the first he mentions, *Father Catrou*, he says, maintains upon the authority of the Bramins, that the Indians were originally a colony from Egypt. But this, I think, is carrying the matter too far, much farther than is warranted by any antient Historian. It is enough to suppose, what, as I have said, is proved by the testimony of the Indian Historian *Muttelu ul Anwar*, quoted by *Ferishta*, that the Egyptians, when they overran the country, first under *Osiris*, and then under *Sesostris*, left behind them

* Ibid. page 1171.

† Page 221.

them a colony, such as Sesostris certainly did at Colchis upon the Euxine Sea, when he overran Asia. But we are not for that to believe that so great a country as India was wholly peopled from Egypt. The two authors whom La Croze mentions, Chatrou the Jesuit, and Bishop Huet, think the matter, he says, so clear, that they have not taken the trouble to give any proof of it. But this defect La Croze has supplied *, and has shown very clearly, from the conformity betwixt the religion and manners of the two countries, that the Egyptians must have been in India. Upon this, I have insisted very much in the preceding chapter: And, indeed, as the Indians never were in Egypt, I think it is a demonstration, from the nature of the thing, that the Egyptians must have been in India.

And thus, I think, I have proved, both from the nature of the thing, and from the authority of authors, antient and modern, that the Egyptians, in antient times, were in India. Now, this of itself is a very important fact in the history of man, that, in so very early an age, a great army should have come all the way by land from Egypt to a country so remote as India.

This point being settled, the only question that remains to be determined, upon this subject of the intercourse betwixt Egypt and India, is, Whether the Egyptians, when they went to India, learned civility and arts there, or taught them to the Indians? This, in my opinion, is no difficult question, though I know, there are who maintain, that the Egyptians got their arts and sciences from the Indians. For, in the *first* place, if we believe the tradition among the learned in India, there can be no doubt, that the Egyptians imported civility and arts into that country. *2do*, I think it is impossible, by the nature of things, that a country, without civility and arts, should have undertaken, and conducted so well, so great an expedition to so distant

VOL. IV.

Qq

2

* Vol. 2. p. 222.

a country; nor is there any example of the like in the history of man. All the nations, which have got their civility and arts from other nations, have not come to these nations, but these nations have come to them, and have conquered them, and in that way civilised them, and introduced arts among them; and, in this way, Osiris, with an armed force, civilised the Indians. *3tio*, The Indians, so far from having it in their power to give a system of polity to the Egyptians, such as I have shown they enjoyed, and the arts and sciences they possessed, were themselves in a most barbarous state when Osiris came among them. This is attested by the author before mentioned, Arrian, who, as I have observed, was better informed concerning Indian affairs, than any other Greek writer, having taken his account of the Indians from Megasthenes, who got his information from the Indians themselves, and particularly from the Princes of the country. He says, that the Indians, before Osiris introduced civility and arts among them, were quite barbarous, feeding upon the barks of trees*. Even as late as the days of Darius the Persian King, Herodotus tells us, that there was a people in India, whom he calls *καλαταιαι*, who instead of burying or burning their dead parents, ate them†. And he mentions another people of India, called *Παδζιαι*, who were so wild, that they lived a nomade life, and fed upon raw flesh. These people, he says, were even more barbarous men eaters than the *καλαταιαι*; for, when any of their number fell sick, his nearest relations killed him, and ate him, alledging that his dying a lingering death, by disease, would make his flesh worse food: And though he maintained, that he was not dying, but would recover, they would not take his word for it, but put him to death, and feasted on him‡. And these Indians, he says, copulated promiscuously and openly as the brutes do||. And he speaks of this people as existing in

* Indica, cap. 5. p. 325.

† Lib. 3. cap. 38.

‡ Ibid. cap. 99.

|| Ibid. cap. 100.

in his time: Nor are we to wonder that the arts, which Osiris imported into India, were not propagated all over that great country, inhabited by so many different people, but were confined to those nations, where Osiris, or Hercules, or their successors, reigned, and to some other in their neighbourhood, which, by communication, may have got those arts from them.

If there could be any doubt, that the Egyptians were the teachers of the Indians, and not their scholars, it is entirely removed by monuments still to be seen in India; I mean statues or busts of *black men with woolly hair*, and which are revered by the natives as the images of Gods. Now, there is no such thing in India, as men with woolly hair; nor are the Indians so black as the Egyptians were, but only of a dark swarthy colour. And not only in India but in China, where the people are all fair, and likewise in Japan, are such images to be seen. Bryant, in his *Antient Mythology* *, gives us, in the words of a man who writes a history of the Dutch embassies to Japan, a description of a great temple in the city of Miacro in that country, where there is a great idol with black woolly hair. He mentions another †, in another temple, whose hair was likewise black and woolly; and speaks also ‡ of other Moorish figures or idols with woolly hair. Among the Siamese, he says, their deity, *Boudha*, is represented in the same way: And, he adds, that *black*, in Japan, is a colour of good omen, which, he says, is extraordinary; for the Japanese are by no means black, nor has their hair any tendency to wool ||. And, in the country of Siam, there is one remarkable bust of that kind, to which religious worship is paid, as Kempfer in his travels has related. Now, the images of those black woolly haired men, can be worshipped as Gods, for no other reason, except that the persons, whom they represent, taught the people of the se-

Qq 2

veral

* Vol. 3. p. 577. and 578.

† Page 580.

‡ Page 581.

|| Ibidem.

veral countries where they are to be found, arts and sciences; the same reason, for which, Diodorus Siculus says, the Egyptians deified their first Kings.

Images of black men with woolly hair, being worshipped as Gods in India, is not, to my great surprize, taken notice of by any of the writers, that I have mentioned, upon the subject of Egypt and India, though, I think, it proves most clearly, that it was the Egyptians, who imported a religion, arts, and sciences, into India. Nations, and the races of men, are distinguished by their bodies, as well as by their minds, and particularly by the colour of their bodies, and also by the colour, form, and figure, of their hair: And in that way, at this day, are the negroes of Africa distinguished, not only from the nations of Europe, but from the nations of Asia, and even from the Indians, who, as I have said, indeed are black, not so black, however, as the negroes of Africa, but are not woolly haired. And this distinction, betwixt the Egyptians and other nations, was as well known in the days of Herodotus, as it is now: For, he tells us, that the Colchians, a colony left by Sesostris upon the Euxine Sea, were known to be of Egyptian origin, by their having woolly hair*. And the same author tells us, that of the Æthiopians, (under which name the antients comprehended all black men), those, who inhabited Lybia,† were of all men the most woolly haired. Now these Lybian or African woolly haired men certainly comprehended the Egyptians, and those whom we now call negroes: Whereas the eastern Æthiopians, Herodotus says, were straight haired men. Of the hair of the Indians he says nothing. But Strabo has informed us of many particulars concerning the Indians, and among others, he has told us, in express words, that they were *στρογγύης*, or *straight haired*†.

And

* See Herodot. lib. 7. cap. 70.; also the Note (†) at the bottom of p. 144. of vol. 3. of this work.

† Strabo, lib. 15. p. 696. marked on the margin.

And thus, I think, it is proved, that the Egyptians were distinguished, and remarkably distinguished, by their woolly hair, not only from other nations, but particularly from the Indians: And, therefore, we know, that those idols of black woolly haired men, to be seen in India and the neighbouring countries, are images of Egyptian men, by the same token that Herodotus knew the Colchians to be originally from Egypt. And, indeed, this makes so great a difference in men, that, if there had been no other proof of the Egyptians having come to India, and having given the people there religion, arts, and civility, than those idols of black men with woolly hair, so different in their appearance from the natives of India and all the other people in that part of the world, I should have thought it sufficient.

With respect to those black woolly haired idols in India, it is proper to observe another thing that has not been taken notice of by any of the writers upon the antiquities of Egypt and India: It is what Arrian tells us in the passage above quoted *, that the name of a successor of Osiris in India, was *Βουδυας*. Now, this *Boudyas* is well known in India, under the name of *Boudha* †; and is adored as a divinity, under the figure of a black woolly haired man. It appears, that his religion was propagated, not only to India, but to many of those eastern countries, such as Siam and China; and even to the Islands of Ceylon and Japan. In the Island of Ceylon he is known by the name of *Budu* ‡; for, as his religion was propagated to so many different countries, his name was differently pronounced according to the different dialects of those countries, but always with a similitude, greater or less, to the original name of *Boudyas*. Mr Bailly, in his letter upon the origin

* Page 302.

† See M. de Guigne's Treatise upon the Religion of India, in the 40th vol. of the Memoires of the French Academy, p. 197.

‡ La Croze, tom. 2. p. 349.

origin of the sciences, calls him *Buta*. In what country he takes that name, he does not tell us; but, he says, that he is the same with the *Fo-boo* of China, and with the God of the Japanese, of the Island of Ceylon, and of Siam*. The Japanese pronounce his name *Budua*, as M. de Guignes tells us†. The Chinese translate his name, and call him, as I have said, *Fo-boo*, which, in their language, signifies *what is very pure*. Of these two words they use but the first, and call him *Fo*; and by that name his religion is well known all over the east. It is, as M. de Guignes informs us in the treatise above quoted‡, not only the most antient religion of India, but it is the religion of China, Japan, Thibet, and a great part of Tartary, and also of some of the eastern islands, such as Ceylon. He was known to be the God of India, in the days of Clemens of Alexandria, who mentions him under the name of *Boota*: And St Jerom also speaks of him, and calls him *Budda*||.

Thus, I think, it is proved, that the Egyptian religion, and with it no doubt civility and arts, were carried not only to India; but from thence were propagated all over the east.

That the Egyptian religion went to Japan, Sir William Jones has given us a most convincing proof, which Kempfer furnishes him, who, as he tells us, resided long in Japan, and had a familiar intercourse with the principal inhabitants of the country§. He says, that the Egyptian idolatry has prevailed in Japan from the earliest ages: And, among the idols worshipped there, is a goddess with many arms, representing the powers of nature, in Egypt called *Isis*, and in India *Isani* or *Isi*. And this image, says our author, as it is exhibited

* Vol. 1. p. 123. and 124.

† Vol. 40. of the Memoirs of the French Academy, p. 197.

‡ Page 197.

|| La Croze, tom. 2. p. 319.—320.

§ See Sir William Jones's Asiatic Researches, vol. 2. p. 379.

exhibited by the German traveller, (that is Kempfer), all the Germans, to whom I showed it, immediately recognised with a mixture of pleasure and enthusiasm *.

There is a memorial of another Egyptian Dæmon preserved in those eastern countries, not by any statue or bust, but in a way more proper for such a wicked Dæmon. It is by the name of *Typhon*, which they give to a dreadful hurricane, that very often rages in the sea betwixt China and Japan. This information I had from more than one traveller in China. And to this may be added, what Sir William Jones tells us†, of the abhorrence which the Indians have of the colour *red*, which was the colour of Typhon, as Diodorus informs us‡, and was therefore abhorred by the Egyptians.

That the Indians make the same distinction that the Egyptians do betwixt the religion of the philosopher and that of the people, I have observed in the preceding chapter ||, where I have said, that, in their sacred books, the unity of God is maintained, and that they believe also in the doctrine of the Trinity, and in other doctrines of theology, which were maintained by the Priests in Egypt. And as they got their philosophical religion from Egypt, so also they got their popular: For Sir William Jones tells us§, that the Trident of Neptune, the Eagle of Jupiter, the Satyrs of Bacchus, the Bow of Cupid, and the Chariot of the Sun, are all to be seen in India at this day. These, Sir William says, are all to be found in Greece and Italy; but it is certain, that the Greeks, as well as the Romans, derived their religion from Egypt: And as the Indians never had any communication,

* Ibid. p. 380.

† Ibid. p. 378.

‡ Page 291.

|| Ibid. p. 292.

§ Asiat. Research. vol. 1. p. 424.

communication, in antient times, with the Greeks and Italians; nor ever at any time borrowed religion, customs, and manners, from them, we must suppose, that they got these, as well as other things, from Egypt.

As to arts and sciences, Sir William, in the passage above quoted, says, that the Bramins and a learned sect in India, that he calls *Sermannes*, dispute in the Forms of Logic; and the Jesuit, father Pons, tells us, that they study logic very much, and examine most accurately the different Figures and Moods of the Syllogism: And Sir William adds, 'That they discourse on the vanity of human enjoyments, and the 'immortality of the soul, her emanation from the eternal mind, her 'debasement, wanderings, and final union with her source.' Then he mentions, 'the six philosophical schools, whose principles are explained in the *Darsauna Sastra*, which,' he says, 'comprise all the 'metaphysics of the old academy, the Stoa, the Lycaenum: Nor is 'it possible to read the Vedanta, or the many fine compositions in 'illustration of it, without believing, that Pythagoras and Plato derived their sublime theories from the same fountain with the sages 'of India *.' And, as to arts, he says, that they have numerous works upon Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, Music, all which, he adds, are excellent and accessible†. Now, I say, that it is impossible, that a nation, in the state in which the Indians were, when the Egyptians came among them‡, could have invented those sciences and arts, but must have got them from the Egyptians together with their religion and their polity; and as sciences and arts never can be invented without a language of art, if I shall succeed in proving, as I hope I shall, that the Indians got even their language from Egypt, this, I think, will be demonstration, that the Indians got all their

arts.

* Ibid. p. 425.

† Ibid. p. 429.

‡ See Page 306. of this vol.

arts and sciences from Egypt. And, I am persuaded, as I have elsewhere observed, that more of the learning and philosophy went from Egypt to India, than went from Egypt to Greece, and from thence came to us. I hold, therefore, that it is chiefly in India that we are to search for those arts and sciences, and that *wisdom* or *philosophy*, as the word ought to be translated *, which Moses learned in Egypt: And, I think, it does great honour to Britain, that we have sent to India so great a scholar as Sir William Jones, who, with the assistance of the learned society which he has there formed, will in time produce to the world the treasures of learning to be found in India. He is by this time, no doubt, master of the key of their knowledge, I mean the Sanscrit language; which, in a letter that I had from him two or three years ago, he told me, he had then discovered, to be a most perfect language, more perfect than even the Greek. Now, in this language, all the books upon arts and sciences in India are written.

Thus, I think, I have proved, not only that the Egyptians were in India, but that they carried with them to that country, religion and polity, arts and sciences: And, that their religion and arts were from India propagated to the neighbouring countries, not only those upon the continent, but to the islands such as Ceylon and Japan.

If this be so, it must appear very surprising, that the French academician, M. de Guignes, who has written three dissertations upon the religion and the arts of India, published in the 40th vol. of the Memoirs of the French Academy, should never have thought of deriving the religion and arts of India from Egypt, but has made them to be all of their own growth, which, as I have said †, was impossible among a people, who, I have shown, were in antient times altogether bar-

VOL. IV.

R r

barous.

* Origin of Language, vol. 5. p. 301.

† Page 312. of this vol.

barous and savage. And it is the more surprizing, that, in the same volume, he has published a dissertation, to prove that the Chinese got their religion and philosophy from the Egyptians; and, in another volume of these memoirs, he has maintained, that they were originally an Egyptian colony. Now, if the Egyptians travelled as far as China, and introduced a religion and philosophy there, it would be very extraordinary, if they had not taken India in their way, and carried to that country, likewise, religion, arts, and sciences. But it appears to me, that M. de Guignes did not know, or did not believe, that the Egyptians ever were in India; for that they had religion, arts, and sciences, among them, he acknowledges, when he says, that they carried them to China.

Among other things that they carried to China, M. de Guignes, in a very ingenious treatise that he has written upon the comparison of the hieroglyphics of Egypt with the Chinese written language, has shown a wonderful connection betwixt that language and the hieroglyphics of Egypt. And there is one similarity, which, I think, it is not improper here to take notice of, as it shows that the Egyptians invented one art more than those I have mentioned. The art I mean is the notation of numbers, not by words, but by certain signs or marks, such as are necessary in setting down and operating upon numbers; which could not be done, if they were many in number, by words. M. de Guignes has particularly observed, that, in the Egyptian hieroglyphics and the written language of China, the number *ten* is expressed by the same mark, viz. the letter X. It was marked in the same way by the Romans; and it is so at this day by us, in imitation of them: And as the Romans were a most antient colony of Greeks, who came to Italy 17 generations before the Trojan war, as the Halicarnassian informs us, I can have no doubt, but that it was the antient mark for that number among the Greeks, which they got, with their other arts and sciences, from the Egyptians,

tians, where it certainly was in most antient times. From the Roman notation of numbers, we may learn the whole progress of the art as it was first practised: They began by marking *unity* by a simple straight perpendicular line: With such lines they went on counting till they came to the number *five*: And this they marked by two of these lines joined together at the lower end, so as to form an acute angle, and make this figure, V. Then they went on adding to this number, V, four units, marked, as I have said, by straight lines: And thus they arrived at the number *ten*; which was very properly, I think, marked by adding the two *fives* together, so as to set the one above the other; which makes the figure X. And then they went on counting by units, fives, and tens, till they came to greater numbers, such as 50, 100, 500, and 1000, which they marked by the letters L, C, D, and M. It appears, therefore, that the first arithmetic was quinary, and not decimal, as among us; and that men at first proceeded in numbering by *fives*, as Proteus did in numbering his sea calves*. And it was very natural that men, when they first began to number, should first count the fingers of one hand; and, stopping there, should begin again, and go to the fingers of the other hand. In this way they counted 10, and there they also stopped, and again went over the same numeration: And it was this second stop, which, I am persuaded, introduced the decimal arithmetic.

And here it may not be improper to observe, how much better the notation of numbers, by what we call Arabian cyphers, but which, as is well known, are truly Indian, is than the Roman notation; by the Indian notation all numbers, however great, are expressed by nine figures, with the addition of *zeros*, denoting only that any of the nine figures prefixed is to be understood as multiplied by as many *tens* as there are *zeros*. In this way, not only the greatest numbers are easily marked, but every operation upon them, of ad-

R r 2

ding,

* Odyss. lib. 4. v. 412.

ding, subtracting, multiplying, and dividing, practised in the easiest way. This art, however, was absolutely unknown to the Greeks and Romans. But, I think, it is probable, that it was an Egyptian invention in later times, after they had taken to alphabetical writing, and disused hieroglyphical: So that, I believe, it came from Egypt to India as well as other arts. For, I can hardly persuade myself that the Indians could have invented it, any more than other arts, which they certainly got from Egypt: Nor do I think, it is well vouched that the Indians have invented any art of any consequence.

The notation of numbers by the antient Egyptian, Roman, and Indian marks, is all that remains in Europe of the most antient of all writing, that is the hieroglyphical. And, though it be very much inferior to the alphabetical writing, which, at the same time that it presents to us the ideas intended to be expressed, gives us also the language or sounds, by which speech expresses them; (so that we have, at the same time, a language that is both spoken and written); yet, with regard to the expression of numbers, it is much more commodious than any language that is spoken or written: For no great operations upon numbers could be performed either by words or writing; whereas, by those hieroglyphical marks, and particularly by the Arabian cyphers, as we call them, they are performed with the greatest ease, and also with the greatest clearness and distinctness.

Thus, I think, I have proved, that arts and sciences came from Egypt to India, even the necessary arts of life, such as agriculture. And, indeed, the Indians, when the Egyptians came among them, were in such a barbarous state, that, I think, it is impossible, they could have invented any art of the least value, and much less science: And I will endeavour to prove, in the next chapter, that they had not invented that art, which is the parent art of all others, and at the same

same time of most difficult invention, I mean language; though it is possible, that they may have varied and distinguished their animal cries by some articulate sounds, which they might have learned by imitation of some birds, such as the cuckoo. But a language of art they never could have formed, but must have learned it from the Egyptians, by whom they were taught their other arts and sciences; for a language of art is itself a work of science, and even of philosophy. Analysis, which is the great work of science, and without which there can be neither science nor philosophy, must be practised in forming a language of art, of which not only the sound must be analysed, and so an alphabet formed, as was done in Egypt, but the sense of the words must also be analysed into what is called *the parts of speech*, but which are first analysed according to the method of Aristotle into *substances* and *accidents*, each of which again is so analysed and subdivided, as to produce the parts of speech we use, without the knowledge of which, there can be no art of language. Such an art, the work of science and even of philosophy, I call the parent art of all other arts and of all sciences, without which no other art of any value, and much less science, could have been invented, or communicated when invented. Now, if I can prove, that this art was not only invented in Egypt, (and where else could it have been invented, but in the only country then in the world where there was science and philosophy), but was carried by the Egyptians to India, I think, it must be presumed, that it came from Egypt to countries less distant than India, and from them to every other country of the earth. And, if so, then Egypt is truly what I have all along supposed it to be, in the course of this work, the native country of all arts and sciences.

C H A P. IV.

The Egyptians must have had the use of a Language of Art before they could have invented so many Arts and Sciences, as it is proved they did invent.—This Language they must have invented themselves, or got from some other country;—no other country but Egypt, where it could have been invented.—The Phœnicians could not have been the inventors of a Language of Art, for reasons which are given.—The question is, Whether Osiris carried to India the Language of Egypt, as well as its other arts?—If the language of India were a barbarous language, it could not be supposed to have come from Egypt.—But the Shanscrit, the original language of India, a language of the greatest art.—This proved by the testimony of Sir William Jones, and of Brassej Halbed:—It excels in the three great arts of language, Derivation, Composition, and Flection, and particularly in the last.—In the pronunciation it has both Melody and Rhythm;—and its Poetry is formed by short and long syllables:—A specimen of that Poetry given by Brassej Halbed.—In that specimen, the words are of great length, and full of vowels.—Their alphabet consists of 50 letters.—The long and short vowels marked by different characters.—The author learned more of the Shanscrit language from Mr Wilkins than he has learned any other way.—Mr Wilkins has proved by fact, what the Author thought could be only proved by argument, that the Shanscrit was the Egyptian language imported into India by Osiris.—This proved by comparing the Greek with the Shanscrit.—General reflections on the transmission of languages from one country to another, and the changes thereby made in the languages.—And, first, as to the pronunciation.—
That

That changes in the same nation; but much more when a language is carried to a different nation, and that nation at a great distance.—
2dly, As to the sense of the words.—This changed, too, by the language going to a different country.—Examples of derivative languages much changed from the original;—such as the Italian, French, and Spanish, and the dialects of the Gothic.—Though these languages did not travel far, yet so changed as not to be intelligible, though one understands the parent language:—So different also from one another, that the understanding of one will not make you understand another.—The change must have been much greater in the antient Egyptian language, when it travelled as far as India, and was introduced among a people so barbarous as the Indians then were.—As it is spoken by the common people there, it is not to be known for the language of antient Egypt, but preserved among the Bramins.—Another observation upon the passage of language from one country to another.—The pronunciation must be very much changed, particularly of the vowels;—also of the consonants.—Words of the same sound do not prove two languages to be the same,—not even if they be of the same sense likewise, unless there be many of them, or words that must have been original in all languages.—
A conformity betwixt two languages in the three great arts of language, Composition, Derivation, and Flexion, the surest proof of their being originally the same language.—The names of numbers, and of members of the human body, and of relations, must be original words in all languages.—1st, Of the names of numbers.—These in Sanscrit the same as in Greek and Latin.—Some anomalies in these numbers of the Sanscrit, and the same in Greek and Latin.—The names of the members of the human body the same in Sanscrit as in Greek and Latin,—also the names of Relations.—The name of God in Sanscrit, the same as in Greek and Latin,—many words of the Sanscrit more Latin than Greek.—Instances of that.—A difference in the sound of the words in Sanscrit, and in Greek, and Latin.—
—This

—*This accounted for, from the great changes in the pronunciation of language.—Of Greek names of places and persons in India, when Alexander was there,—these names more Greek than the present Shanscrit.—The reason of this.—A great many more Greek words to be collected from the Shanscrit.—Mr Wilkins has given the author about 70 more.—Other words he has got from other travellers in India.—Of the resemblance of the two languages in the three great arts of language, Composition, Derivation, and Fleſtion.—Examples of composition in the Shanscrit.—One extraordinary composition, with the A privative, as common in the Shanscrit as in the Greek.—Of derivation in the Shanscrit, Mr Wilkins has given the author no example,—but it is used in that language as well as composition and fleſtion.—Of fleſtion in the Shanscrit.—The great variety of this art of language.—Verbs in μ in the Shanscrit as well as in the Greek,—a specimen of four persons of the present tense of the substantive verb in the Shanscrit, the same with the Greek and Latin.—Mr Wilkins, by comparing the two languages, has proved that in fact the two languages are the same,—has settled, in this way, a fact which was denied by some antient authors, that the Egyptians were in India.—The learned world thereby much obliged to him.*

BEFORE I undertook to prove, that the Egyptians were the inventors of the art of language, I thought it was proper to prove, that they had invented other arts and sciences*. This I hope I have done to the satisfaction of my readers; and if so, the necessary consequence is, that they must have had the use of language, and of a language of art, without which it is impossible that arts and sciences can be invented or cultivated. This language, therefore, they must either have invented themselves, or got it from some other

* Book 2. chap. 4. of this vol.

ther nation. Now, I desire to know, what other nation there was, in those very antient times, that could have invented so great an art and of more difficult invention than any other. Some, as I have observed, think that the Phœnicians may have been the inventors of this art; and that the Egyptians may have got it from them. But I think I have shown *, that it is not only in the highest degree improbable, but even impossible, that such a nation as the Phœnicians should have invented a language of art, the most wonderful of all arts, and, at the same time, of the most difficult invention; and I have shown also, that it is highly probable that, as they antiently lived in the neighbourhood of the Egyptians, they got this art, as well as other nations did, from the Egyptians. And they borrowed one thing from the Egyptians, which no other nation did, I mean circumcision †; for the Colchians, who practised circumcision, were a colony of Egyptians; and the Jews were directed by their God to use that rite.

Taking it, therefore, for granted, that the Egyptians invented the language of art they must have used, I am to inquire, in this chapter, whether Osiris, with the other arts he brought with him to India, did not also bring the art of language. If the language of India were a barbarous jargon, such as the languages I have mentioned in the first volume of the Origin of Language, it might be thought to have been invented by themselves, or learned from some other barbarous nation in their neighbourhood. But if it can be shown to be a language of the greatest art, such as never could have been invented by the Indians, in the state they were in when Osiris came among them, nor by any other nation in the world except the Egyptians, it will follow of course, that it must have been imported by Osiris. Now, the original language of India, of which all the other languages

VOL. IV.

S f

spoken

* See p. 277. of this vol.

† See Vol. I. of Origin of Language, p. 632. (2d edition).

spoken in that country are dialects more or less corrupt *, is the Shanscrit, the most perfect language that is, or, I believe, ever was, on this earth; for it is more perfect than the Greek. This Sir William Jones, who is well known to be learned in many different languages, and particularly in the Greek, has told us in one of his publications: But if he had not said so, we know so many particulars concerning the form and structure of it, as to be convinced that he is in the right.

Mr Brasley Halhed, in his preface to the translation of the Code of Gentoo Languages, has told us several things concerning the Shanscrit, which show it to be a language of the greatest art: And particularly it abounds in flexion, which, as I have more than once observed, is the greatest art of language: For it has no less than seven declensions, with singular, dual, and plural numbers; and in the other two great arts of language, derivation and composition, it is also, he says, very abundant. The pronounciation of it, he says, is as musical as that of the Greek, having both melody and rhythm; so that, when it is spoken, it appears to be a kind of recitative, very like what the Jews use in their synagogues †. Their poetry, like the Greek and Latin, is formed by long and short syllables ‡: And our author, in his preface §, has given us some specimens of their most antient poetry, where the quantities are exactly marked; and it is to be observed, that the words are of great length, and full of vowels, which must give a very pleasant sound to their poetry, and in general to their language. Their alphabet, he says, consists of 50 letters, and their short and long vowels are marked by different characters, which shows the regard they have to the rhythm of their language; and it is to be wished, that the Greeks and Romans had shown the same regard to

* The names of places and of persons, which in all languages must have been among the first words, are all, according to my information, Shanscrit words.

† Page 25.

‡ Page 27.

§ Page 26.

to the rhythm of their languages, which would have saved the scholar a great deal of time and trouble.

But, concerning the Shanscrit, I have not learned so much from any author that I have read, nor from any man with whom I have conversed, as from Mr Wilkins. He, as I have said elsewhere*, studied this language for 16 years under two Bramin masters, and, I am persuaded, understands more of it than any man in Europe. Before I had the pleasure of his acquaintance, I thought it highly probable, that a language of so great art as the Shanscrit could not have been invented in a country so barbarous as India was when the Egyptians came to it, but was imported into India with other arts by Osiris. But now I am not only convinced of this by arguments, but Mr Wilkins has proved it by facts: For he has proved to my conviction, such a resemblance betwixt the Greek and the Shanscrit, that the one must be a dialect of the other, or both of the same original language. Now, the Greek is certainly not a dialect of the Shanscrit, any more than the Shanscrit is of the Greek. They must, therefore, be both dialects of the same language: And that language could be no other than the language of Egypt, brought into India by Osiris, of which undoubtedly the Greek was a dialect, as I think I have proved†. But, before I give the reader the proofs which Mr Wilkins has furnished me, by comparing the two languages together, and showing how much they resemble one another, I will make some general reflections upon the transmission of languages from one country or nation to another, and what changes they must necessarily undergo in their passage.

And, in the *first* place, as language is an art of vulgar and daily use, passing through the mouths of the whole people of a country,

S f 2

it

* Vol. VI. of Origin of Language, p. 149. in the note at the bottom of the page.

† Vol. 1. Origin of Language, book 3. chap. 13.

it must necessarily undergo many alterations even in the same nation; nor do I believe, that there is a nation at present in Europe, in which the language now spoken is the same that was spoken three or four hundred years ago. But the change must be much greater, when the language passes to a nation living at a great distance, and under a different climate, and where consequently the organs of pronunciation must be affected more or less by the difference of climate. And not only the pronunciation of the words, in this passage, from one country to another, will be changed, but also the sense of the words, which is a thing as arbitrary as the sound, and therefore very liable to be altered, as well as the sound, by common use.

How much a language, derived from another, may be changed from the original, both in sound and sense, the French, the Italian, and Spanish languages are a clear proof. They are undoubtedly derived from the Latin, and yet are languages so different from the Latin, as not to be understood by a man who only understands the original language; and so different from one another, that the knowledge of one of them will not make you understand the other two; yet there is a great similarity to the Latin in the sound of very many of the words, and in the sense also; and there is a good deal of the art of the Latin language in them, particularly in the genders and numbers of nouns, and in the tenses of verbs formed by flexion, though they have lost the forming the cases of nouns by flexion. The same is the case of the English and other dialects of the Gothic, which are so much changed from the original language, preserved in Iceland, that the knowledge of it will not make you understand any of its dialects spoken on the continent of Europe, and which are all so different from one another, that by understanding one of them you do not understand any other of them. Now, if these languages, which did not travel far, (and one of them did not travel at all,

all, I mean the Italian, but was learned by the Goths and Lombards in the country itself), are so much changed from the original, What must have been the case of the language of Egypt, which travelled as far as India, and was imported among a people so barbarous as the Indians then were, very much more barbarous than those nations who learned the Latin or the Gothic? And, accordingly, the Sanscrit, which, I think, I may call the original language, is so much corrupted in the common dialects of it spoken in India, that if it had not been preserved among the Bramins or Priests, one of the institutions, which Osiris brought with him, among many others, from Egypt, it would have been entirely lost; but, as it is preserved among them, it appears to be a more pure dialect, of the antient Egyptian, than even the Greek.

Another observation, I make upon the transmission of languages from one country to another, is, that the pronunciation must needs be very much altered, and particularly that of the vowels, which, as they are nothing but the breath modified in a certain way, are very liable to be changed in the same language spoken in the same country, as is evident from innumerable examples that might be quoted in Greek and Latin. The consonants, too, of the same organ, are very apt to be changed into one another, even by the people of the same country, but much more by foreigners who learn the language, and whose organs of pronunciation, if they live under a different climate, must, as I have observed, be affected by the climate, and therefore operate differently. Another observation I make is, that some words, in different languages, being of the same sound, will not prove the language to have been originally the same; for that may happen by accident, and even if some words should be the same in sense as well as in sound, neither will that prove the languages to be of the same origin; for it often happens, that one language borrows words from another, though the one language be not the original
of

of the other, nor both derived from the same original. But, in order to prove that the languages were originally the same, there must be many words in both agreeing in sense as well as sound, and these such as must have been original words in every language, denoting things which must first have got names in every language; so that when these names are the same in two languages, we are sure that the two must have been originally the same.

My last observation is, that, as the art of a language is less arbitrary and more determined by rule than either the sound or sense of the words, it is one of the principal things, by which the connection of languages with one another is to be discovered: And, therefore, when we find that two languages practise the three great arts of language, derivation, composition, and flexion, in the same way, we may conclude, I think, with great certainty, that the one language is the original of the other, or that they are both dialects of the same language.

To apply these observations to the similitudes which Mr Wilkins has discovered betwixt the Sanscrit and the Greek;—I will begin with these words, which, as I have said, must have been original words in all languages, as the things denoted by them must have been known in the first ages of civility, and have got names; so that it is impossible, that one language could have borrowed them from another, unless it was a derivative or dialect of that language. Of this kind are the names of numbers, of the members of the human body, and of relations, such as that of *father*, *mother*, and *brother*.

And, *first*, as to numbers, the use of which must have been coeval with civil society. The words in the Sanscrit, for the numbers from *one* to *ten*, are *ek*, *dwée*, *tree*, *chatoor*, *panch*, *shat*, *sapt*, *aght*,
nava,

nava, *das*, which certainly have an affinity to the Greek or Latin names for those numbers. Then they proceed towards 20, saying *ten* and *one*, *ten* and *two*, and so forth, till they come to 20; for their arithmetic is decimal as well as ours. Twenty they express by the word *veenfatet*. Then they go on till they come to 30, which they express by the word *treenfat*, of which the word expressing *three* is part of the composition, as well as it is of the Greek and Latin names for those numbers: And in like manner they go on expressing 40, 50, &c. by a like composition, with the words expressing simple numbers, viz. 4, 5, &c. till they come to the number 100, which they express by *fat*, a word different from either the Greek or Latin name for that number. But, in this numeration, there is a very remarkable conformity betwixt the word in Shanscrit expressing *twenty* or *twice ten*, and the words in Greek and Latin expressing the same number; for in none of the three languages has the word any relation to the number 2, which, by multiplying 10, makes 20, such as the words expressing the numbers 30, 40, &c. have to the words expressing *three* or *four*; for in Greek the word is *εἰκοσι*, which expresses no relation to the number *two*; nor does the Latin *viginti*, but which appears to have more resemblance to the Shanscrit word *veenfatet*. And, thus it appears, that in the anomalies of the two languages of Greek and Latin, there appears to be some conformity with the Shanscrit.

As to the members of the human body, Mr Wilkins has given me the names of three of them, of the *foot*, which is *pada*, undoubtedly the same with the *πους ποδος* of the Greeks, and for the *nose*, which is *nasa*, the same with the Latin word *nasus*. There is another word which he has given me, a word of great importance, and which must have been as antient in every language as the religion of the country. It is the name of God in Shanscrit, which is *Deva*, and is the *θεος* of the Greeks, and comes nearer to the *Deus* of the Latins,

Latins, whose custom it was to change the asperated *r* or *e* into the middle letter *D*.

And here the reader may observe, that as the Latin is the most antient dialect of the Greek, many of the words of the Shanscrit have a greater resemblance to the Latin than to the Greek. Thus, as I have observed before, the word *nasa*, denoting a *nose*, is plainly Latin, but entirely different from the Greek word expressing that feature of the face, which is *ρῖν*. *Apa*, which in Shanscrit signifies *water*, has the greatest resemblance to the Latin word *aqua*, but none at all to the Greek word *ὕδωρ*; and here is another word which must have been originally in all languages. And I shall only mention two words more, *veedhava*, in Shanscrit, which is the *vidua* of the Latins, but is quite different from the Greek word *χρησ*; and *laka*, which is the Shanscrit word for *locus*, but is quite different from the Greek word *τοπος*.

In these words the reader will observe, that there is a good deal of difference in the sound betwixt the Greek and Latin words and the Shanscrit: But there is nothing in language so changeable as the pronounciation of it, even in the same nation. But, when the language goes to a different nation, especially to one at such a distance as India is from Egypt, when there must be an intercourse betwixt the two nations, such as might preserve, in some degree, the original pronounciation of the language, the change must be very great.

To the words which Mr Wilkins has given me, I will add some that are preserved in Diodorus Siculus, and Arrian's *Indica*: And, as they are the names of places and persons in India, when Alexander was there, they are undoubtedly very antient words of the Shanscrit, as the names of persons and places are the most antient words in all languages; they have, therefore, more of the Greek sound
in

in them, than the words which Mr Wilkins has furnished me, being of an older dialect of the Shanscrit, as we may suppose, than those of Mr Wilkins, which are from the Shanscrit language as it is at present. The words are, ταξιλα, the name of a Town in India*; γλαυκονικαι, the name of a Nation in India†; καθαιοι and οκυδιωκοι, names of Nations also‡; Ὑδραωτης, the name of a River, and Πιμπραμα, the name of a City||; μουσικανος, the name of a King in India§; οκυδρακαι, the name of a Nation¶; Ἀρματηλια, the name of a Town**; Ὑαλαι, the name of a City; Ωριτη, the name of a country††; and Ωριται, the name of the people of that country‡‡; εμβολιμα, the name of a City|||; Ὑδασπις and Ὑφασπις, names of Rivers; τοφανις, ταφοσιρις, &c. Other words of the same kind might no doubt be found; but these, I think, are sufficient to show, that the names of places in India, the most antient words in all languages, were originally Egyptian words, the Greek being, as I have shown §§, a dialect of the Egyptian; which language being lost as well as the people, its affinity with the Indian can be no otherwise proved, than by the affinity of the Indian with the Greek, a dialect of the Egyptian still preserved. In short, there were, in antient times, so many Greek names of places and persons in India, that when I travel with Alexander through India, as his expedition is described by Diodorus Siculus and Arrian, I think I am travelling through Greece.

This may suffice, at present, to show the similarity both of the sound and the sense of the words of the two languages, though I know that a great many more words of the same kind might be produced.

VOL. IV.

T t

duced.

* Arrian, p. 356.

† Ibid. p. 380.

‡ Ibid. p. 385.

|| Ibid. p. 386.

§ Ibid. p. 439.

¶ Diod. Siculus, lib. 17. cap. 98.

** Ibid. cap. 103.

†† Arrian, p. 103.

‡‡ Diod. Siculus, cap. 104.

||| Arrian, lib. 4. cap. 28. p. 329.

§§ Vol. I. of Origin of Language, book 3. chap. 13. 2d edition.

duced. And Mr Wilkins has given me a catalogue of about 70 more; but, as I expect he will still give me more, I will not publish the catalogue he has given me till he has compleated it, which I hope he will do, and then either he or I shall publish it. In the mean time, I have collected from some other travellers in India, Shanfcrit words that are clearly Greek, such as *gonia* the Shanfcrit word for an *angle*, *kentra* for a *centre*; and they use the word *bora* in the same sense that it is used in Latin.

I come now to speak of the resemblance betwixt the two languages, in what I think of greater consequence for proving them to have been originally the same language; I mean the art by which they are formed. The art of language, as I have observed, consists of three things, Composition, Derivation, and Flektion, by which the words of language are so connected together, both in sound and sense, that words, though of the greatest number, amounting, as it is said the words in Latin do, to five millions, may notwithstanding be comprehended in the memory, and readily applied to use. Now, if it can be shown, that in these three great arts, there is a resemblance betwixt the Shanfcrit and Greek, I think there is an end of the question.

And, *first*, as to Composition, Mr Wilkins has shown me, as I have observed, that, in denoting numbers, they compound the word expressing *units* with the word expressing *ten*. And he told me of another composition, of the word denoting the number *three* with the word denoting *a foot*; for, says he, observing one day a three-footed stool in a Pagoda, on which a statue was placed, I asked the Bramin who was with me, what the name of it was in Shanfcrit, and he told me it was *tripada*. And in like manner they compound the word *danta*, signifying a *tooth*, with the same number *three*, and say *tridanta*, that is a *trident*.

But

But a more extraordinary composition in the Shanscrit, than any I have hitherto mentioned, and which is the same in the Greek, and is so remarkable a peculiarity in both languages, that I think it is impossible it could exist, except in languages that were originally the same. The composition I mean is of words with the letter *ā*, implying a negation of the quality expressed by the word, for which reason it is called, by the Greek grammarians, the *a privative*, such as the words, *ακρατος*, *αλελαβης*, and hundreds of others. Now, I am told, not only by Mr Wilkins, but by others who have applied to the study of the Shanscrit, particularly Mr Hastings, who is not only a good Greek scholar, but learned in the Shanscrit, that this composition is as common in that language as it is in Greek.

As to Derivation, Mr Wilkins has afforded me no particular examples of this branch of the art of the Shanscrit language, but as it is a more simple art than either composition or flexion, I think it must abound in it as much as I shall show it does in a more difficult part of the art, I mean flexion. Mr Halhed, in the passage I have quoted from him, says, that it abounds in derivation as well as in composition and flexion; and if it were not so, it could not deserve the very high eulogium which Pons, the Jesuit, has bestowed upon it, which is, that it is so regularly formed from a few roots, that a man, who has made himself master of those roots, and of the rules of its composition, derivation, and flexion, may, from the roots, form himself a language, which will be understood by those who are learned in the Shanscrit, though it may differ from the language in common use*.

I come now to speak of the *third* and greatest art of language, in my opinion, I mean flexion; by which, with a small variation of the word, genders and numbers of nouns are expressed, also cases are formed, by which the various relations, that the noun has to the

T t 2

other

* See Vol. 26. of Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses.

other words in the sentence, are signified: And in verbs, the time of the action with all its variety of present, past, and future, and compounds of these; also persons and numbers, and likewise the disposition of the mind of the speaker, with respect to the action, affirming, wishing, or commanding it, are expressed. This wonderful art, Mr Halhed tells us, abounds in the Shanscrit; and, as it is a more perfect language than the Greek, I imagine it excels the Greek in this greatest art of language. The same Mr Halhed tells us, that the Bengalese language, which I hold to be no more than a corrupt dialect of the Shanscrit, has a class of verbs that are conjugated in the same way, as the verbs in $\mu\alpha$ in Greek are. And Mr Wilkins has given me four persons of the present tense of the substantive verb in the pure Shanscrit, which is as follows: *Asmee, I am; ascee, thou art; astee, he is; santee, they are*: The three first of which are the Greek words $\epsilon\mu\mu\iota$, $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon$, $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$; and the last is the *sunt* of the Latins. And as the Shanscrit resembles the Greek and Latin so much in the flexion of their verbs, we cannot, I think, doubt of its resembling those languages likewise in the flexion of their nouns, and the other declinable parts of speech.

Thus, I think, Mr Wilkins has done what no man before him has done; having proved by facts, from the comparison of the two languages, that the Greek and Shanscrit are dialects of the same language, the antient language of Egypt, as certainly, I think, as it is proved that the English, Swedish, and Norwegian, are dialects of the Gothic; and which language of Egypt is thus proved to have been carried to India, as it is certain that the Indians never were in Egypt. And as several of the antient authors doubted of the Egyptians ever having been in India, and the learned Strabo positively denies it, I think the learned world has great obligations to Mr Wilkins for having established so curious a fact, not only in the history of language, but in the history of man.

CHAP.

C H A P. V.

The Language imported by Osiris into India is still preserved under the name of the Sanscrit.—It is the Sacred Language of India; now understood only by the Bramins.—It is to be presumed, that the Language of Egypt, as it went as far as India, went also to the neighbouring countries.—But, besides presumption, there is proof from facts.—This furnished by M. Gebelin in his Monde Primitif.—He, and Bullet in his Celtic Dictionary, maintain, that there was a primitive Language, from which all the other Languages on earth are derived.—That such a Language did exist, M. Gebelin has proved, by comparing the several Languages in the world with one another,—the European, Asiatic, and American, Languages compared together by him.—America peopled from the north east parts of Asia.—A curious fact related of a singular custom of the Egyptians which the Americans have adopted.—The method which M. Gebelin has followed in making this comparison, very proper, by finding out the radical words in the several Languages.—Of the difference of sound of derivative words from their radicals in the same Language; but this difference much greater in different dialects of that Language.—An exact account, digested into tables, given by Gebelin, of the changes of derivative words from the original.—The change of vowels in the derivative Languages, not so great as of consonants:—The reason for this.—But consonants also changed.—This makes the difference so great betwixt the original and derivative Languages.—Of the monosyllables of the Chinese Language;—many of them to be found in other Languages, and particularly in the Coptic.—Thus proved, that there was a time when there was only one Language on the face

face of the earth.—The author, before he read M. Gebelin, was of another opinion.—What that Language was M. Gebelin has not determined.—All the Languages of Europe, he says, are derived from the Celtic.—But the Celts did not invent their Language, nor the Goths theirs.—The Gothic a more perfect Language in some respect than the Latin.—Any nation speaking a Language of art, only proves that the original Language came to them in greater perfection than to other nations.—The resemblance betwixt the Celtic and other Languages, no proof that these Languages are derived from the Celtic.—The Greek Language was certainly not derived from the Celtic, but came directly from Egypt.—If the Greeks did not invent their Language, how can we suppose that the Celts or Goths did.—The progress of the formation of the Language of art, in Egypt, must have begun with words of one syllable.—In that way the Chinese monosyllabic Language is to be accounted for.—These monosyllabic words were the roots of the primitive Language.—A great question, By what rule, or whether by any rule, these roots were formed.—The letters, according to M. Gebelin, are to be considered as a kind of roots.—The Author's opinion in this matter:—Nothing, even among men, done without some reason.—Many words formed from the sound.—Even ideas may be expressed by a sound, which is supposed to have some analogy to them.—The Sanscrit, according to Father Pons, a most wonderful piece of art and science.—It analyses the particular ideas, expressed by the words, into the general ideas from which they arise.—These expressed by monosyllables, which are the roots of the Language.—Monosyllables being the simplest words are the fittest for derivation and Composition.—From these roots, in long order and with great variety, are deduced, according to fixed and determinate rules, the words of the Sanscrit, expressing the particular ideas, falling under the general ideas denoted by the roots.—Examples of this given by Pons the Jesuit;—a knowledge of the roots, and of the Grammar of the Language, together with the rules of derivation

vation and composition, will enable a person to form a Language of his own, which will be understood by those who know the art by which the Language is formed.—The Jesuit Pons's account, of this Language, confirmed by Mr Wilkins.—This Language the work of philosophers.—It may be compared to the Categories of Archytas.—The Greek and Latin, though not so perfect as the Sanscrit, wonderful works of art,—connecting by means of Derivation, Composition, and Flexion, some millions of words.—Flexion the greatest of these.—Its wonderful effects in nouns and verbs.—In the Greek verb upwards of a thousand variations.—M. Gebelin, though learned in languages, knew so little of the philosophy of Language, as to maintain that men speak naturally, and have from nature the ideas they express by the words.—According to him, two persons meeting, who had learned no Language, would hold communication together by speech, and understand one another.—This the primitive Language of Gebelin:—According to him, all other arts, as well as Language, natural to men; and they have from the beginning the knowledge of astronomy, and of all the arts of life.—No natural state according to Gebelin, the Savages, at present to be found, being men degenerated.—The Author's system, from antient books, very different from Gebelin's;—though an admirer of Greek learning, and a reader of many books in that Language, M. Gebelin has not read their philosophers, who would have taught him the progress of man from capacity to energy.—Without Greek philosophy, no natural talents or application will avail.—Contradictions in Gebelin's system;—it is refuted by the fact, of deaf persons being likewise dumb, and being taught to speak with great labour and much difficulty.—Even the most barbarous Language a work of art, if the words express all the ideas of the speaker, and are connected together.—Men, in the natural state, without the use of speech, are in the case of dumb men:—They could not teach themselves:—But the Dæmon Kings of Egypt, who invented Language, must first have taught themselves, and then others.—Progress of the art
even

even in Egypt.—The first words there monosyllables.—The Language in that state went to China:—When a Language of words of several syllables was invented, these monosyllables were made the roots of the Language.—In this way the Shanscrit was formed.—But the Chinese have preserved the Language, in monosyllables, as they got it.—The great imperfection of that Language.—The question, In what country Gebelin's primitive Language was invented?—It could be no where but in Egypt, where the Dæmon Kings reigned.—The Jews had no Language revealed to them,—no country in such a state of civility, when Osiris went to India, that they could have invented the most barbarous Language.—Of the way the Egyptian Language was communicated to other nations, and how it came to be so barbarous as it was spoken by some nations.—It was conveyed to India by Osiris, and by him deposited in the hands of the Bramins, who have preserved it with little or no corruption, but have not improved it.—It also went to Greece, but not in so great purity as to India,—was preserved there by Homer and the other poets.—Next to the Greek Language, it is in the greatest purity in the Celtic.—This proved by its resemblance to the Latin,—and by the name of Shanscrit being a Celtic word.—Surprising that in some of the most barbarous Languages, a good deal of the art of the antient Egyptian Language should be preserved,—as in the Gothic;—even in the Language of Greenland there is a dual number.—How so many Languages, differing so much from one another, should be all derived from one primitive Language, accounted for.—The variety made in the two Egyptian alphabets still more wonderful.—Objection answered, that it was not consistent with the wisdom and goodness of God, to confine the invention of Language to one country.—That country sufficient for the purpose.—The variety of the system of nature did not admit that many countries should be so well fitted for that purpose.—Objection, that all the people on earth have not learned the use of speech, particularly the Orang Outangs.—But they may

may still learn it, as some wild people in Ethiopia have done.—

IN the preceding chapter I think I have proved, both by arguments and facts, that Osiris carried with him to India, among other arts, the art of language, which, as well as the polity he introduced into that country, is still preserved, under the name of the *Sbanfrit*:—That it is now their sacred language, in which their most antient religious books are written, and is understood only by the Bramins, that is, the priests of India, though it appears to have been once the general language of the country;—and that this language could be no other than the language of antient Egypt.

Thus I think I have proved, that Egypt was not only the parent country of many other arts and of sciences, but also of that first art among men, and the foundation of all other arts and sciences, I mean the art of language; at least that it was so with respect to India: And if it travelled as far as India, I think it may be presumed that it went to the neighbouring countries in Africa, Asia, and Europe. But, in the history I am giving of the origin of arts and sciences, I would not have a matter of such importance in that history, as the origin of an art, which, as I have said, is the parent of all others, rest upon mere presumption and probability, and therefore I will try to prove by facts, that language came from Egypt to other countries, as well as to India. But before this can be done, it must be first proved that there is, or was, at some time or another, one original language, of which all the languages on earth are derivatives. But this is a subject where Mr Wilkins can give me no assistance, which I regret very much. I must therefore have recourse to a French author, *M. Gebelin*, who has written a book entitled *Monde Primitif*, in nine volumes in quarto, in which

VOL. IV. U u he

he has endeavoured to prove, that all the languages now in the world are derived from one language, which he calls the primitive language: For that there is or was such a language, he lays down as a principle, in which he says many learned men agree with him; and there is one author, very learned in language, M. Bullet, who, in his Celtic Dictionary, has made a collection of many words from several languages that he mentions, which he says are words of this common language. But M. Gebelin has taken a much wider range, and has gone through not only all the languages of the old world, but even those of the new; and has endeavoured to shew, that they have such resemblances, and are so connected with one another, that they must be all derived from one original, or primitive language. But where this original language was invented, or where it now is or ever was, neither he nor M. Bullet has said. But that is not the question at present, which is only whether such an original language exists, or ever did exist in any country. Now this M. Gebelin has endeavoured to prove, by comparing together all the several languages I have mentioned, and which, indeed, are all the languages of the world. And I think he proceeds upon a principle which cannot be disputed, that languages, which resemble one another, not only in the sound of the words, but in the sense of them, must be all derived from one common language; for otherwise it is impossible to account for such a conformity. This work, in which he compares with one another all the languages, antient or modern, that are known, is the greatest work upon language that ever was undertaken; and, in executing it, he shews, I think, a wonderful knowledge of many languages, and also very good judgment in comparing them together. The reader, therefore, I hope, will think himself obliged to me, if I give him a summary view of it.

He not only examines the languages that are now spoken in Europe,

rope, or that were formerly spoken, such as the Greek, Latin, Celtic, Gothic, and their several dialects; but the Asiatic languages, such as the Hebrew, Arabic, Phœnician, and Chaldean, and also the Malayse language, and that spoken in the island of Madagascar. And he has gone to the east as far as China; and he might have gone farther still, even to Japan, betwixt the language of which and the Teutonic, a late German writer has discovered a great resemblance. And he has not confined himself to the old world, but has crossed the Atlantic, and gone, as I have said, to the west, and examined the several languages spoken in the different provinces of North and South America, and also in the islands of the South Sea*.

As to America, I am convinced that it was peopled from the north-east parts of Asia, from which it is at present divided by a very narrow sea, full of small islands, which look like stepping-stones between the two continents. And I think there is reason to believe that there was a time when they were not divided at all by any sea: For there is a French author, M. le Page du Pratz, whom I have mentioned elsewhere†, who travelled a good deal in North America, and in his travels met with an Indian, who had travelled in that country much more than he, and who told him that he had met with an old Indian who, in his youth, had known an old man that had seen the two continents joined‡: So that the sea appears to have made an irruption there, and to have separated the two continents, in the same manner as it separated Sicily from Italy, of which the name of the town in Italy, built upon the strait, was a memorial; for it was called *Reggium*, a word which in Greek, denotes *bursting* or *breaking*. I think it is probable that Britain was separated from France in the same manner;

U u 2

and

* Vol. 8th, p. 489. and following.

† Vol. 3. of this work, p. 53.

‡ P. 303. of the History of Louisiana, by M. le Page du Pratz.

and undoubtedly many such changes have happened on this earth, of land into water, and also of water into land*.

The Asiatics, who peopled America from the north-east parts, as I have said of Asia, would undoubtedly carry their language with them, and did so, as it appears, to the most northerly parts of America: For it is now discovered, that there is a very great affinity betwixt the language of the Kamschatkans, who inhabit those north-east parts of Asia, and the language of the Esquimeaux; and there is also a great resemblance in their customs and manners, and likewise in their faces and persons. The language, thus brought into America, must, according to my hypothesis, have come originally from Egypt: And with it there is come into North America a very singular custom of the Egyptians, as it is remarked by Herodotus, and which was peculiar to them; I mean the custom of the men making water sitting, and the women standing. This is the universal custom among the North American Indians, as Mr Adair, in his history of the American Indians, has told us†. And he has told us in the same place, that he was informed that it was also the custom in Mexico. Now this author was longer in America than I believe any European ever was, who returned to Europe; for he was forty years in that country; and, as he was a trader with the Indians, was very much among them, not only in the way of business, but often in their parties of pleasure, and sometimes in their campaigns. He therefore had an opportunity of being very well informed of the facts which he relates, especially a fact of this kind falling under common

* See, upon this subject, Strabo, Lib. 1. towards the middle; where there is a very curious account given of the several changes that have happened in different countries, by Inundations and Earthquakes.—See also upon the same subject, Sheringhame, *De Anglorum Origine*.

† Page 216.

common observation. Nor can we suspect him of any intention to impose upon the reader with respect to this fact. If indeed he had maintained that the Indians of North America were descended of the Egyptians, and came from that country, he might be supposed to have feigned this fact, in order to support his system, if he had known, what I do not believe he did, that this was a peculiar custom of the Egyptians. But his hypothesis, which he has endeavoured to maintain by many arguments, is, that these Indians were a colony of Jews, which came off about the time that their city was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, and themselves transported to Babylon. Now, among the Jews, it is well known that the men pissed as we do in Europe; and accordingly, *pissing against the wall*, is, in the language of the Old Testament, made a characteristical mark of the male sex.

This circumstance may appear trifling to many of my readers; but I think it tends not a little to support my system of the languages of these Indians in North America being derived from Egypt, as well as every other language: For it proves, that the men, who from Kamschatka peopled America, must have had some communication with the Egyptians, not immediately, I believe, but by the intercourse of other nations. And when they adopted this singular custom of the Egyptians, I must suppose that they also learned their language.

In making this wonderful investigation, M. Gebelin has followed, I think, a very proper method: For he has endeavoured to discover the radical words in the several languages he examines; which he supposes, very justly, must have been words of the primitive language. Nor indeed could the resemblance betwixt so many different languages have otherwise been clearly made out; for we know, that derivative and compounded words differ very much in
found

found from the original ; and very often the analogy of the sense is not very evident. For this purpose our author has compiled several etymological dictionaries, particularly a French one, a Latin, and a Greek, wherein he has ranged the words according to their several *families*, as he calls them. And though some of his etymologies may be conjectural and fanciful, yet, upon the whole, he has made such a system of these languages as never was made before ; for it is only by reducing the words of a language to a few roots, from which all the other words proceed, that we can make a system of any language. And it is to be observed, that in the etymological dictionaries of the languages I have mentioned, he has found almost all the roots in other European languages, such as the Celtic, or in the Oriental languages, such as the Hebrew and Arabic ; for as all those languages, of which he has given us etymological dictionaries, are derived from the other languages I have mentioned, it is of necessity that a great part of the roots should be found in these other languages. These, therefore, must be the parent languages of the Greek, Latin, and French. But still the difficulty recurs, From whence were the Celtic, Hebrew, and Arabic derived ? and M. Gebelin answers, From his *Primitive Language*, to which, as I have observed, he has not assigned a country ; but this defect, I hope, I have supplied, and have proved that country to have been Egypt.

Another thing to be observed of those derivative languages, is, that the words in them, derived from the original language, must be much altered from their roots in the sound. Even in words derived from the roots of the same language, we observe a great change in the sound, which is very observable in the Greek and Latin derivatives, in which the difference is sometimes so great, that it requires a great deal of knowledge of etymology to find out the root. But when the words are derived from another language, the change must be very much greater ; for when a language is brought from
another

another nation, living, as it often happens, in a different climate, and therefore with organs of pronunciation different, and so pronouncing the same letters differently, the change in the language must be very great.

Of these changes of words brought from other languages, or of derivatives in the same language from their radicals, he has given us, in his third volume *, six tables, containing the several changes of vowels into vowels, or vowels into consonants, and of additions made to the same word, or diminutions of it; and in these tables he has taken his examples both from the languages of Europe, antient and modern, and from the Oriental languages. As to vowels, he has observed, very properly †, that the vowels change more easily into one another than the consonants. And indeed if we consider, that the vowels, as I have observed in another place ‡, are nothing more than a certain modification of the breath, by which the consonants are pronounced, it is no wonder that the vowels should be changed into one another; or, in other words, that the consonants should be pronounced by a different modification of the breath: Whereas the consonants articulate the vowels, and make language of them, which, without them, would be nothing else but vocal sounds. The changes, therefore, of consonants into one another, make a much greater difference in the language, than the changes of vowels, though the difference be not so great when consonants of the same organ are changed into one another, as B into P, or M or F into V, which are all labial consonants: And accordingly, in the different dialects of the same language, they are frequently used one for the other, of which our author gives many examples. And when to these changes, the other changes he mentions

are

* P. 152, and following.

† Ibid. p. 151.

‡ P. 111. of this vol.

are added, it is no wonder that the resemblance of different languages to one another, and spoken by people at such a distance from one another, as the people of Europe are from those of Asia and America, should be so difficult to be discovered. The Chinese language is so different from all other languages we know, that one should think it was impossible to find any resemblance betwixt it and those other languages. But M. Gebelin has found out a resemblance that is really wonderful betwixt their monosyllables, and the languages of Europe and Asia*. And it is the more wonderful, that their monosyllables are very different from the syllables in those other languages: For they never terminate their syllables with any consonants except the nasal consonants M and N; and some consonants they have no use of at all;—So that I think the example of the Chinese language serves to support our author's system more than that of any other language. And there is an observation made by M. de Guignes, in the treatise he has written, to prove that the Chinese were originally a colony from Egypt, which is not taken notice of by our author, but which tends very much to support my system of the Egyptian language being the original primitive language, more than the examples from any other language; and it is this, that the language of the Copts, which is the only remains to be found in Egypt of the antient language of that country, there are a great many Chinese monosyllables to be found.

And thus, I think, our author has proved by facts, what from theory I have been of a great while disposed to believe, that originally there was but one language upon earth. But my knowledge of different languages was not so great as to enable me to prove it by facts; and accordingly I have concluded the first volume of the Origin of Language, with giving my opinion, that all languages were

* Vol. 3. p. 367.

were not derived from one language, invented in one country; though I had then discovered, that all the languages of Europe, antient and modern, and the languages spoken in the western parts of Asia, and in a part of Africa, were all originally the same language, and which was the antient language of Egypt*. But then I did not know that this antient language was still preserved in India, and that the Greek was a dialect of it, though I thought there was good reason to believe that the Greeks had got from Egypt their language as well as their other arts. Neither did I know any thing of the Chinese language, or that it was possible to make out any connection betwixt it and the languages of Europe, or the oriental languages, such as the Hebrew and Greek. And as to the languages of the new world, or the islands lately discovered in the South Sea, I did not think it was possible that there could be any resemblance betwixt them and the languages of Europe, or those of the western parts of Asia. But Mr Gebelin has now discovered this connection. And as to languages so barbarous as the hissing language of Troglodytes in Abyssinia; or the muttering jargon of those savages, mentioned by Condamine, on the banks of the river Amazons, spoken, as he says, by drawing in the breath; or the language of the Hottentots, and the people lately discovered by a French traveller to the west of New Mexico, who supply the defects of their articulation by smacks;—I take the case to have been, as I have elsewhere mentioned †, that they had had but very little intercourse with the people who spoke the original language, only enough to form the idea of articulation, and to learn, perhaps, some few words of it. It is therefore to M. Gebelin that I owe this great discovery in the history of man; and I am now fully convinced of the truth of what Moses has told us, that time was when there was only one language and one speech upon the earth; which I was disposed to

VOL. IV.

X x

believe

* See the three last chapters of vol. 1st, of *Origin of Language*, second edit.

† Vol. 1. p. 663. second edition.

believe upon the authority of Moses, but could not reconcile it with facts, thinking that it applied only to the languages in the western parts of Asia.

But our author has not explicitly told us what this primitive universal language is, where it was invented, where it is to be found, or whether it now exists. He has told us, indeed, that the Greek and Latin, and all the languages spoken at present in Europe, are derived from the Celtic; but he has no where said that the Celtic is not itself a derivative from some other language: Or if he had said it, I should not have believed him; for the Celts, though a very warlike people, were certainly not a people of arts and sciences, and therefore not capable of inventing the language they spoke, any more than the Goths were capable of inventing their language, which, as it is preserved in Iceland, is a more perfect language than the Celtic, having what the Celtic has not, nor any language spoken at present in Europe, and which I think one of the greatest arts of language; I mean cases of nouns formed by flexion: And in several respects it is a more perfect language than even the Latin; for we are not to suppose that because a people speak a language of art, therefore they invented it, otherwise we must suppose that the Greenlanders invented their language, which has a dual number, and a first and second future*, as well as the Greek. The fact truly is, that this primæval language, which I say was invented in Egypt, was a language of the greatest art, as we may judge by what is preserved of it in India. And this language was spread all over the earth: But it is impossible to suppose, that to every country it was transported in the same degree of perfection that it was spoken in Egypt. I am persuaded it has suffered less in India, than in

* This information I had from an acquaintance of mine, whom I mentioned before, Mr Thorkelin, who has told me a great many other curious particulars of that language, having studied a grammar of it, which is published.

in any other country to which it was carried, being preserved there, as a precious deposit, in the hands of a body of men more resembling the priests of Egypt, who certainly spoke it in the greatest purity, than any other body of men now in the world. No other nation, I am persuaded, got it in such purity as the Indians did; or if they had got it, they could not have preserved it so pure, not having among them such a society of men as the Bramins of India. And my wonder is, that so much of it has been preserved in some nations, and particularly among the Goths, who have always been reckoned a barbarous nation; nor is it, I think, at all to be wondered, that so little of it has come to other nations, or has been preserved among them.

As to the Celtic, it is no doubt true that the Greek and Latin, the Oriental languages, and all the languages now spoken in Europe, have a great connection with it. But this does not prove that all these languages are derived from it, but only that they all came off from the same common stock: And particularly as to the Greek, we are sure that it came directly from Egypt, being imported by the Egyptian colonies who settled there, and by the governing men who came with them, such as Cecrops, who no doubt would bring with them their language, as well as their other Egyptian arts*. Now, if the Greeks, who were certainly a most ingenious people, and appear to have cultivated arts and sciences very much, even in early times, did not invent their own language, how can we suppose that a barbarous people, such as the Celts and the Goths, invented theirs. It is evident, therefore, I think, that they must have got their language from Egypt, as well as the Greeks, though I believe not so directly and immediately, but through the channel of other nations.

X x 2

The

* See upon this subject what I have said in the 13th chap. of book 3d of vol. I. of the Origin of Language, where I think I have removed every shadow of doubt concerning the origin of the Greek language being from Egypt.

The Celts were certainly a very antient nation, more antient in Europe than the Goths, who did not come to the northern parts of Europe from the Tauric Chersonese, now called Crim Tartary, under their leader Odin, till about the time of Julius Cæsar. And, they were a much more numerous nation than the Goths; for they inhabited all Gaul, Britain, Ireland, and a great part of Spain, and also of Italy. I think, therefore, it is likely, that they got the language of Egypt more early than the Goths or any other European nation, except the Greeks, who, as I have just now said, learned the Egyptian language from the Egyptian colonies that were settled among them. I think, too, it is probable, that, from the Celts, the language of Egypt was propagated to many other nations. This, I think, M. Bullet has made evident in his Celtic Dictionary, where he has shown, that the words of the Celtic are likewise words of a wonderful number of other languages, such as the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Gothic, German, Saxon, &c. And there is one word he mentions, and a capital word in all languages, I mean the name of *Man*, which he has shown to be a word, not only in all the languages of Europe, but in the Persian, the Turkish, the Mogul languages, and even in the oldest dialect of Greek, I mean the Latin, where one should hardly expect to find it. But it is there, not indeed by itself, but in composition, in the word *Mancipium*, which signifies a man that is taken and made a slave of*. And, I think, it is likely, that the Celts must have seen some antient writing of the Egyptian language, called by the name we use to denote it, and which I understand to be the name which the Bramins give it, I mean *Sanscrit*, which, in the dialect of the Celtic, that is at this day spoken in the Highlands of Scotland, denotes *antient writing*. And as it is the name given by the Bramins to their language, I am persuaded it is an Egyptian word.

Thus,

* See the Celtic Dictionary, tom. 3. p. 133.

Thus, I think, I have proved, that there was once upon the earth but one language, from which all the languages that are now spoken, or were spoken in antient times, are derived. If the reader is not yet satisfied, concerning this original language, by what I have said of the similarity betwixt so many different languages, I can direct him to books, where the similitude, betwixt particular languages, is demonstrated to be such as could not happen by accident. There is particularly Sheringham, *De Anglorum Origine*, from p. 99. to 110. where he has proved a wonderful likeness betwixt the Welch and Greek languages. And the same author, in the same work, p. 359. has proved a surprising conformity betwixt the Saxon language and the Greek: And, as I have said *, there is a late German writer, who has discovered a great affinity betwixt the Teutonic, and the language of Japan. If the reader is not satisfied with all these authorities, I would have him read what I have written in vol. 1. of the Origin of Language †, where I have said a good deal of the migration of languages from one country to another, and particularly of the Celtic, which not only spread itself over the greatest part of Europe, but found its way to the north-east parts of Asia, and even to America.

Thus, I think, I have proved the opinion of M. Bullet and Gebelin, that there was once an original and primitive language, from which

* Page 339.

† Book 3. chap. 12. p. 587. and following, of 2d edition. In this chapter, (p. 585.) it is observed that language is the most lasting of all the memorials of men; and of the language itself, the names of places are more lasting than any other words of the language; for they are preserved when the language itself is no longer a living language, nor preserved in any written monuments. In this way I have said that the Celtic is preserved in France and Spain, and I might have added in England and the low country of Scotland, where the Celtic language has long ceased to be spoken or written. And I observe that M. Bullet has very properly made use of the similarity of names of places, in proving languages, that are now very different, to have been originally the same.

which all the languages, that now are, or ever were, upon earth, are derived. This, I think, is of itself a very great discovery, in the history of arts and sciences, and of man. But if it be likewise true, what I have endeavoured to prove, that the native country of this original language was Egypt, and that it was the parent country of other arts and of sciences; I think, I may say, that I have completed the history of arts and sciences, which I think a most important part of the history of man, as it is by these he is made an intellectual creature in *actuality*, and not in *capacity* only, as he was in his natural state.

As there must have been a progress in the art of language, as well as in other arts, and I believe a longer and more difficult progress than in any other, I will here observe the first step in the formation of a language of art. Men, when they first began to speak, would naturally draw out the articulate sounds they had learned to a great length, resembling their animal cries before they had learned to articulate, and which we know is the case at this day of the barbarous languages. But when they began to form a language of art, it was natural that they should first make words of one syllable, before they made words of two or more; for the progress of all arts is from what is simple to what is complex. And this first beginning of a language of art, is, as I have elsewhere observed*, still preserved in China, being imported to that country from Egypt, before it was there brought to perfection. And this, I think, is the only way that so extraordinary a phenomenon, as the Chinese language is, can be accounted for; for I do not think that, imperfect as it is, it could have been invented by the Chinese themselves, who are, I believe, what Dr Warburton calls them, a dull uninventive people. And as M. de Guignes has proved that they got their hieroglyphical or symbolical writing from
Egypt,

* Vol. 6th of Origin of Language, p. 108. See also what I have said, p. 276 of this volume.

Egypt, I think it is to be presumed, that from thence they got likewise their language.

And here a curious question occurs: By what rule, or whether by any rule, those first monosyllabical words, which I agree, with M. Gebelin, were the roots of the primitive language, and consequently of every language derived from it, were formed? And M. Gebelin is of opinion, that those roots were not names given by chance to things, but that there was a reason why one syllable was employed to express a certain thing rather than another; and the reason, he says, was some resemblance betwixt the sound of the word, and the thing expressed by it. And he is at great pains to shew, that there is not only in the composition of letters making syllables, but in every single letter, an expression of some idea, sensation, sentiment, or feeling, of one kind or another; so that he makes even of single letters a kind of roots.

As to my opinion in this matter, I so far agree with M. Gebelin, that I believe man does hardly any thing by mere chance; and that the maxim of Mr. Leibnitz's Philosophy, That there is a reason for every thing, will apply to the works of man as well as to the works of nature, in so far that man does nothing without a reason, though very often not a good or sufficient reason, but such as moves him to act. I likewise agree with him, that there are many words, I believe, in all languages, which express, by their sounds, the things signified by them, such as the words *crash*, *gurgle*, *roar*, and many other in English. And further, I think that not only corporeal things, perceived by the senses, may be so expressed, but also the ideas and sentiments of the mind, may likewise be denoted by sounds which have some analogy to them. And accordingly we may observe, that in English, and I believe in all languages, the words denoting the operations of the mind, are metaphors taken from

from the actions of body, such as *weigh, ponder, reflect, prospect, retrospect, &c.* And in this way M. Gebelin thinks that the letters, or a certain composition of them, have an analogy to the ideas and sentiments of the mind, as well as to the objects perceived by our senses. Nor is M. Gebelin singular in this opinion; for Plato, in the *Cratylus*, has maintained the same doctrine; but for my part I think that there is so much fancy and conjecture in this matter, and so little certainty, that I do not chuse to say any thing more concerning it, except that I think it shews language not to be a natural operation, as many suppose it to be, and among others M. Gebelin himself, but a work of the greatest art, so great, that we are not able to give a satisfactory account of the first principles of it, I mean the formation of the radical sounds, or first words of it.

And here I return again to the Shanscrit language, which, according to the account given by Father Pons the Jesuit, who was a missionary in India, is a most wonderful piece of art, and of science too; for it analyses all the particular ideas expressed by the words, into the general ideas from which they arise: And these are expressed by monosyllables, which are the roots of the language; for M. Gebelin is certainly in the right, when he says, that the roots of the primitive language must have been all monosyllables, which are the simplest words, and therefore best fitted for derivation and composition. From these roots are deduced, in long order and with great variety, but ascertained by fixed and determinate rules, all the several words of the language, expressing particular ideas, which fall under the general ideas denoted by the roots. And he gives an example of this in the monosyllable *kru*, which denotes the general idea of *action*; and from it are formed, by derivation and composition, all the words, of number no doubt very great, expressing the different kinds of action. And in this way, he says, if you are possessed of the roots of the language, and the rules of derivation and com-

composition observed in it, you may form a language of your own, which, though different from the common language, will be very well understood by those who know the art by which the language is formed. This account, given by the Jesuit, agrees perfectly with what Mr Wilkins told me of the formation of the language, which he learned both from the Bramins, who taught him the language, and from a grammar of it that is in his possession. I will only add, that a language of such art, must have been the work of philosophers, who know that all sciences begin with analysis, by which we rise to general principles, and from these descend to particulars. And there is one of the greatest works of science, to which, I think, the Shanfcrit language may fitly be compared: The work I mean is, that upon the Categories by Archytas, the Pythagorean philosopher, and after him by Aristotle; for, in that work, all the ideas of the human mind are reduced to certain general ideas, called Categories, from which all our particular, or less general, ideas, are deduced.

But even the Greek and Latin, though languages not near so perfect as the Shanfcrit, are wonderful works of art, when we consider, that by means of derivation, composition, and flexion, they contrive to connect together five millions of words, (the number of words in the Latin language according to Bishop Wilkins), so that they may be comprehended in the memory and readily applied to use. Of these three great arts of language, the greatest, as I have observed *, is flexion, by which, in nouns, not only genders and numbers are denoted, but the relations of things to one another are expressed by the cases: And, by the conjugation of verbs, not only persons and numbers are expressed, but time and almost every circumstance of the action; which makes such variations in the flexion of the verb, and of its participles, that it is computed, a single Greek verb produces more than 1000 words.

VOL. IV.

Y y

Before

* Page 346.

Before I conclude this chapter, in which I have bestowed so much praise on M. Gebelin, and, I think, so justly, I cannot help observing, that it appears to me very surprising, that a man so learned, as he is, in so many different languages, should know so little of the philosophy of language, as to maintain, that men have not only from nature the organs of speech, but that they speak naturally, as naturally as they breath; and that they have from nature, also the ideas which they express by words, and, that the words are so much the natural signs of those ideas, that they are immediately understood by those who hear them: So that two men meeting together, who had learned no language, could communicate together by speech, and understand one another perfectly well. And this natural language is what he calls the primitive language*.

If this account of the origin of language be true, I see no reason why every art may not have been practised by man, without teaching or use, as well as this most difficult art of language. And, accordingly, our author has said †, that men, from the beginning, knew the principles of astronomy and the solar year: And he thinks, that men were, in the very beginning of their existence upon this earth, perfect in all the arts of life; so that what is commonly called the natural state, never had any existence; though he does not deny, that men at this day are to be found in a very savage and barbarous state: But, says he, those men are degenerated from what they were originally; and the reason of this degeneracy, he says, has been conquest, tyranny, and oppression ‡.

How different this system of human nature is from that which I have delivered upon the authority of antient books, must be evident to every reader; and, indeed, it appears to me to be so repugnant,
not

* Vol. 3. p. 70. and following.

† Vol. 8. p. 34.

‡ Ibid. p. 16.

not only to philosophy, but to common sense and observation, that to argue against it would be time very idly spent. The author has professed himself a great admirer of the Greek learning || ; but he appears to have carried the study of that learning no farther (which is the case of very many Greek scholars) than the understanding of the language, and the reading many of the books in it. But he has not carried it to what I hold to be the perfection of the Greek learning, that is, their philosophy. From it he might have learned, that man is by nature a creature only capable of intellect, and consequently only capable of arts and sciences ; and that the history of man is an account of his progression from a state of mere capacity, to a state of energy and actuality. And the example of this author convinces me more and more, that no man without antient philosophy, whatever his natural talents or application may be, (in neither of which, I think, M. Gebelin is deficient), can understand the principles of any art or science, not even of language, nor be so much a philosopher, as to understand the philosophy, or even the history of his own species.

This language of M. Gebelin, which may be called a language of instinct, like the cries of the brute animals, by which they communicate with one another their appetites and desires, and which are perfectly understood among themselves, is what our author calls the primitive original language. When I first began to read his work, I understood his system to be, that this had been the original language of every nation ; and that the languages now spoken were that language, but with those changes and variations, which length of time must introduce into every language ; and, indeed, I think, this is the natural consequence of his system. But, upon a farther perusal of his work, I find, that he agrees with the common opinion, that one language is derived from another. And, accordingly,

Y y 2

he

|| Vol. 9. in the beginning.

he makes the Greek, Latin, Gothic, and Sclavonic, to be all derived from the Celtic *. How far this is agreeable with the rest of his system, I leave the reader to judge.

But there is no need to show contradictions in his system, or to confute it by arguments; for there is a fact very well known, which at once puts an end to it. The fact I mean is, that deaf men are likewise dumb, and cannot articulate not only words of several syllables, but not even monosyllabical words, of which, M. Gebelin says, that the primitive language consisted. They cannot, therefore, pronounce the first elements of speech; yet they have the organs of pronunciation, such as we have that are not deaf. And, accordingly, they may be taught to speak, though with great labour and much difficulty, and even to speak well; for I heard a female scholar, of the Abbe de l'Epe, in Paris, speak so well, and so fluently, (not with that hesitation and frequent stops with which I have heard Mr Braidwood's scholars speak), that I could hardly distinguish her speaking from that of any other person. And the reason why there is so much difficulty in teaching them, is, that they have not the sense of hearing, so as to learn to speak by imitation, as our children do. Now, what must be learned either by teaching or imitation, is certainly a thing of art and not of nature.

But I have spent too much time (the reader, I am persuaded, will think) in explaining this very extraordinary system, which I believe no author before M. Gebelin maintained. And I will conclude my account of his work, with observing, how very difficult the invention of language must have been, not only of a language of art, such as the Sanscrit, Greek, or Latin, but of the most barbarous languages, expressing only the ideas of the speaker, and connecting those ideas together some way or other, however imperfect, but without

* Vol. 9. p. 206.

without which there can be no speech. Men in the natural state without the use of speech, or having ever heard it pronounced, are precisely in the case of dumb men. Now, can we conceive, that such men, though they have the organs of speech as perfect as other men, and accordingly may be taught to use them, but with much labour and difficulty, should be able to teach themselves. The reader, therefore, will not be surprised, that all along, in the course of this work, I have supposed that language could not be invented without supernatural assistance; and, accordingly, I have maintained, that it was the invention of the Dæmon Kings of Egypt, who, being more than men, first taught themselves to articulate, and then taught others. But, even among them, I am persuaded, there was a progress in the art, and that such a language as the Sanscrit was not at once invented. They, therefore, began with articulating only monosyllables; and when the language was in that rude state, it was conveyed through the channel of India to China. But when a language of art was formed in Egypt, and words of many syllables were invented, a proper use was made of those monosyllables; for they were made the roots of the language, from which, by derivation, composition, and flexion, so wonderful a work of art, as the Sanscrit, was formed. But the Chinese, wanting those Dæmons of Egypt to teach them, and being deficient also in genius and natural parts, have kept the language in the same infantine state they got it from Egypt; which is so imperfect, that, as I have observed*, they use it in no matter of science, not even in law and the administration of justice: And even in private conversation, about the ordinary affairs of life, they often cannot make themselves understood without signs and gestures; and sometimes they are obliged to have recourse to their written language.

M. Gebelin having established, as I think he has done, that there must be some primitive language from which all the other languages

in

* Page 107.

in the world are derived, the only question that remains to be considered is, In what country this language was invented? And, I think, it is evident, that it must have been in Egypt, for, as it could not have been invented without supernatural assistance, which the Egyptians had from their Dæmon Kings, what other country besides Egypt had such Kings. The Jews were no doubt assisted by God in establishing religion, government, and laws, and were conducted by him, through the greatest dangers, into the promised land, which they conquered by the miracles he wrought in their favour. But it is no where said, that he interposed to give them a language, nor indeed was there any necessity for such an interposition, as they had got a language from Egypt. But, supposing no such supernatural assistance necessary for the invention of language, there was no nation on earth in such a state of civility, (at so early a period, as when Osiris went to India, and when language in Egypt had been, as I have said, invented), that they could have invented even the most barbarous, much less a language of such art as he carried with him to India.

From Egypt it was propagated all over the earth. For language, as I have elsewhere observed, is an art of easy communication, as far at least as regards the articulation of it, to an animal so imitative as man, especially by the voice; and in that way it was communicated to most nations. For the most barbarous of them, hearing the Egyptians speak, or any other nation that had learned from them, would naturally imitate the articulate sounds; and, having got some of them with the sense annexed to them, and, at the same time, having formed a habit of articulating, they, with these few words, would make a language of their own, in imitation of the articulate sounds they had learned. And this, I think, is a very natural account of the many barbarous languages that have been derived from this so perfect language. But the Sanscrit I hold to have been conveyed to India by Osiris, in great purity,

purity, with not only the sound and sense of the words preserved, but also the whole art of the language; and it was deposited there in the hands of the Bramins or Priests, an order which he had instituted, by whom it has been preserved till now, I will not say in perfect purity, but I believe very little corrupted. But, that it was improved by them, I cannot believe, from what I have heard of them from Mr Wilkins, who tells me, that they are not at all of an inventive genius, and can only preserve, in their memories, what they have learned from their books or their ancestors, and cannot very well explain even that. Next to the Indians, the Greeks appear to have got it in the greatest purity; and it was preserved among them by their poets, who were their first writers, and first cultivators of arts and sciences. Among the antient writers of Greece, Homer holds the first rank; and, if his poems were to be diligently compared with the Sanscrit, there would, I am persuaded, be found in them more of that language than in any other Greek book. It was his writings which preserved the Egyptian language from being as much corrupted in Greece as it was among the common people of India: For the several dialects of the Greek language, I hold to have been all derived from his poems, not his poems from these dialects, as many people absurdly suppose.

The Celts, as I have elsewhere observed*, are a very antient people, and were once very wide spread all over Europe: They got, therefore, I am persuaded, the Egyptian language more early than any other European nation except the Greeks, who, as I have said, learned it from the Egyptian colonies that were settled among them. And, I think, it is probable, that, from the Celts, the language was propagated to many other nations. And the Celts, themselves, appear to have preserved it very carefully: For their language has a very great resemblance to the Latin dialect of the Greek; and I was told, by a man, who seemed to understand it very well, that

* Page 348.

the first line of Virgil's *Æneid* was all Celtic words, except the proper name of *Troja*; and, as I have observed in the passage last quoted, the word *Sbanscrit*, which is the name given by the Bramins to their language, denotes, in the dialect of Celtic spoken in the Highlands of Scotland, *antient writing*.

To these observations I will add one more. It may at first sight appear very surprizing, that there should be so many languages, I do not know how many hundreds, all different from one another, and yet all derived from the same original language. But language, passing through so many mouths, not only of the same nation, but of so many different nations, and travelling all over the globe, is the most changeable of all the arts, I may say of all the things belonging to men. Alphabetical characters, which certainly came from Egypt where they were invented, one should think much more fixed and permanent than the sound or sense of language. Yet, though there were but two kinds of them in Egypt, the one, which they called their sacred characters, the other, their popular, when they went to other countries, they multiplied to 74 different alphabets, of which specimens are given us in a book published in Rome upon the writing art, written by a countryman of mine, of the name of Elphinston, as I remember. Now, I doubt whether any one of these alphabets had the exact figures of either of the Egyptian alphabets: And we are to consider, that the writing art travelled to very few countries, compared to the number of those to whom the language of Egypt was propagated; for it is only a few nations of learning, that have the use of written characters.

And thus, I think, I have proved, both by fact and argument, that Egypt was the parent country of all arts and sciences, even of that parent art, without which there could have been no other art, nor even civil society itself.

It

It may be thought that it is derogatory from the providence and goodness of God, to suppose that he should have confined the invention of arts and sciences, which are of absolute necessity, for restoring man from his fallen state, to one country only. But I answer this objection, in the same manner as Aristotle has answered many others of the same kind;—That providence, as it leaves nothing undone that is necessary or proper, so it does nothing that is unnecessary or superfluous. That the country of Egypt was sufficient for the invention of arts, and propagating them all over the earth, the event has shown. But, besides, as the universe is a system, and the most perfect of all systems, and as in every system there must be variety as well as order and uniformity, it was impossible, that every country should be as well fitted by its situation, its climate and soil, and the genius of its inhabitants, for the invention and propagation of civility and arts, as Egypt. It was, therefore, perfectly agreeable to the wisdom and goodness of the great author of nature, that this country should be selected for that purpose, and that a race of Kings should be given them of intelligence superior to men, (without which, all the advantages of nature I have mentioned, would not, in my opinion, have availed), such a race as is not, nor ever was to be found, in any other nation.

That all nations should have made the same progress in arts and sciences that the Egyptians did, would have been inconsistent with the difference we find among men as well as among other animals, and with the variety of situations and circumstances, which must necessarily be. It may be objected, that some people have not yet got the use of speech, such as the Orang Outangs; so that they can neither invent nor learn any art or science, nor even live in civil society. But my answer is, that, though the Orang Outang has not hitherto learned to speak, he may still learn it in some future time. The savage people in Æthiopia, who, in the

time of Diodorus Siculus, had not learned to speak *, have since learned it; for there are now no people in Æthiopia who have not the use of speech: And, in the same manner, if by one of those many revolutions, which happen in the affairs of men, a people of arts should settle in that part of Africa where the Orang Outangs live, and mix with them, I think there can be no doubt that they would acquire the faculty of speech, though, I am persuaded, very slowly, as Peter the wild Boy did.

CHAP.

* See p. 123. of this vol.

C H A P. VI.

The history of Religion fitly subjoined to the history of arts and sciences.

—*In what sense Religion is natural to man :—It does not belong to him in his natural state, nor even when he lives in herds,—but only in the civilized state ;—not even in the first ages of civility.—This proved both by the reason of the thing, and by three examples.—The knowledge of a God arose from man's studying himself.—The progress of that study, and the reasoning, by which men were convinced of the existence of such a Being.—As men formed the first idea of a God from themselves, they naturally made him like themselves, consisting both of body and mind, but both more excellent than theirs.—Egypt the country in which Religion had its origin, as well as arts and sciences.—This proved both by the reason of the thing, and the authorities of authors.—Egypt having been governed so long by Dæmon Kings, there were two Religions there, a Philosophical Religion, and a Religion for the vulgar.—Religion went from Egypt to Greece ;—also to India, where several monuments of the Religion of Egypt are to be seen at this day.—The idea of a God went to other countries as well as to Greece and India, though not the worship as practised in Egypt.—A plurality of Gods according to the first Religion among men ;—but one principal among them, according to the Religion both of Egypt and Greece.—As those antient Gods were supposed to have bodies, they had also senses that were to be gratified ;—and their minds also were to be gained, in the same way as the minds of men, by things presented to them.—The first things offered to the Gods were the fruits of the earth.—The memory of these offerings preserved both in Egypt and*

Greece.—When men began to eat flesh, animals were offered to the Gods.—This done so constantly when they killed animals, that to kill was said to sacrifice.—This enjoined in some nations as a duty,—particularly among the Jews.—The Gods, by those sacrifices, were supposed to have their smell gratified, and their ears pleased by the music accompanying the sacrifice.—Their eyes also pleased by magnificent Temples, Altars, and Processions.—In return for these offerings, it was expected that the Gods would give them success in war and their other occupations;—and would reveal to them future events, which they supposed was done in many different ways.—Among the Jews, Moses was obliged to establish a Religion resembling the Religion of the times:—They were incapable of receiving any other.—This the state of Religion in the first ages of the world, before arts and sciences had made any considerable progress.—But after arts and sciences were improved, Religion wore a very different face.—All arts, sciences, and Philosophy, came originally from Egypt.—From Egypt they went to Greece.—Of the great discoveries made by Philosophy in Theology.—Of the Platonic Doctrine of the Trinity.—The first, second, and third persons of that Trinity explained.—An error shown in our English translation, with respect to the second person of the Trinity.—Of Plato's doctrine with respect to a state of pre-existence, and a future state of rewards and punishments.—The Religion of the Philosophers of Egypt brought to Greece, and from Greece to Italy,—where it was much cultivated among the Romans.—The popular Religion of Egypt also came to Greece and Italy.—The opinions of the Philosophers must have had an influence even upon the opinions of the world.—Of the state of Religion at the time when our Saviour came to the Earth.—The understanding of man so much then improved, that they had formed the idea of Beings superior to themselves —But their ideas of such Beings very gross.—By the advances made in Sciences and in Philosophy, men were disposed to receive a purer Religion when our Saviour

viour came to the world.—The days of ignorance were then over, as St Paul has said in his speech to the Athenians.—An account given of that speech.—It contains the system of pure Theism, and gives a description of the true God.—Of this God even the vulgar, among the Athenians, appear at that time to have had some idea.—St Paul says nothing of the particular doctrines of Christianity, except in one verse, where he speaks of the resurrection of Jesus Christ.—This laughed at by the Athenians,—though probably the Egyptians believed in the resurrection of the body.—St Paul would explain to his Converts the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, as 1st, The doctrine of the Trinity, of which an explanation is already given in this chapter.—2do, The doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God,—of which an explanation is here given. 3tio, The incarnation, which is likewise here explained.—Another important doctrine of Christianity is, that we must not believe that we can be happy in this life, but must look forward to the next.—This inculcated by our Saviour.—He has also provided for our happiness in this life, if we will obey the last precept he gave his Disciples, to love one another.—The Christian Religion, more a Religion of Love than any other;—yet by the abuse of it, has produced more dissensions among men, and more crimes than any other Religion.—Of the end of this World, and the restoration of things.—This a doctrine of Antient Philosophy, with which the revelation by Jesus Christ agrees.—According to it, that new World is not at a very great distance.—This to be proved in the sequel of this work, by showing that not only the minds and bodies of men are degenerated, but their numbers decreased.—Thus is proved that our Saviour came to the world in the fulness of time, when it was proper he should come.—If he had come sooner, and in the days of ignorance, his doctrine could not have been received.—This proved by the example of barbarous nations, who cannot be converted to the Christian Religion;—and of the Jews themselves.—The singular circumstance

stance of the Jews, that they are a nation without a country.—They are in all nations, and of no nation.—The worst thing in the Heathen Religion was their sacrifices.—These must have been offensive to the true God:—But that they should be practised, was necessary among people who had not an understanding so cultivated, as to make them capable of understanding true Religion.—It was indulged even to the Jews.—The reason for this indulgence.—But after the coming of our Saviour, Sacrifices, Rites, and Ceremonies, were laid aside, and a pure Religion established,—but not all Rites were laid aside, and particularly not Music.—Of the effects of Music in exciting Devotion.—It ought to be more practised by the Missionaries among the barbarous nations.—Of the present state of Religion on this earth.—Christianity the Religion of Europe,—also of Egypt, in the country about Alexandria.—There both the Jewish and Christian Sabbaths are observed.—In the Western part of Asia, Mahomedism prevails;—in the Eastern, the popular Religion of Egypt which went to India.—The Philosophical Religion also went there, as the Bramins believe in the Trinity.—Conclusion of the History of Religion, Government, Arts, and Sciences.—These three comprehend the History of Man, as from them proceed all the operations of the intellect of man.—What is commonly called History, is not what the Author calls a History of Man;—nor is it a matter of science.

IN the preceding chapters I have given the history of the origin and progress of arts and sciences. To this, I think, it will not be improper to subjoin the history of religion; a thing of the greatest importance to man, and which, I think, I have shown, and will farther show, is very much connected with arts and sciences. And as religion is of the utmost importance to man, the history of it, I think, is a material part of the history of man.

Those

Those, who think that religion is natural to man, are in the right, if they mean that by nature he is religious, when he has gone through that progress by which he becomes truly a man, that is, an animal of intellect and science. But if they mean that he is religious in his natural state, they either do not know what that state is, or what religion is: For, in his natural state, he is a mere animal, distinguished only from other animals by his having the capacity of intellect and science. Now, in that state, it is impossible he can form any idea at all, much less an idea so noble and exalted as that of God. It is for this reason that *Peter the Wild Boy*, as I have elsewhere observed*, had no idea of a God. And not only solitary savages, such as he was, have not that idea; but, after they are associated and come to live in herds, as the Orang-Outang does, they are not able to form that idea. Civil society, therefore, is absolutely necessary for introducing religion among men: And I have further shown†, that, even in the first ages of that society, men do not form the idea of a God; for what ideas they then form, are only of corporeal substances, and their operations upon them or upon one another, their only care and attention being concerning the necessities and conveniencies of life. This, I think, I have proved, in the passage referred to, not only by the reason of the thing, but by facts. And I have mentioned two examples, the people of the Pelew Islands, and those of New Zealand, who, though they have the use of language, and have made some progress in the necessary arts of life, yet have no religion. And to these two examples may be added a third, the inhabitants of Botany Bay, as I was informed by a gentleman of the name of Walker, who was four years in that country purser of a man of war; and a fourth example

* Vol. 3. p. 371.

† Chap. VI. of book II. of this vol. p. 153.

ample in the people of the Ladrone Islands*. And, in general, wherever we find any nation little advanced in the arts of civility and Government, but who have got the idea of a God, we may conclude, that from some other nation more civilized, with whom they have had a connection, they have got that idea. This I have shown was the case of the inhabitants of North America †: And, I am persuaded, the same was the case of the inhabitants of Guiana; who, according to Dr Bancroft's account of them ‡, have got the idea of a Supreme God, (such a God as the Indians of North America call *the Great Spirit*;) but which they must have got from European nations, particularly the Dutch, with whom they have had an intercourse for more than a century past.

Thus it appears, that, while man was conversant only with external things, he could not form the idea of a God. It was, therefore, necessary, before he could do this, that he should practise the precept of the Delphic God, and besides the knowledge of external things, should study and know himself; for, as I have observed in more than one place, it is only by knowing ourselves, that we can have any knowledge of superior intelligencies. By this study, he would discover that there was something within him, which we call *mind*, whereby he moved his body, and, by the intervention of it, other bodies, and by which he conducted his life, and provided what was necessary for his subsistence and defence. But this is not all; for it was further necessary that he should look round him, and consider the works of nature, both in the heavens and earth; where he would perceive that there were motions going on, such as he could not perform, and with very much greater order and regularity than his motions. And here there would be an exercise, not only of the intellectual, but of the reasoning

* See, upon the subject of those Islands, Churchill's Coll. of Voy. vol. 4. p. 459.

† Page 153 of this vol.

‡ See his Essay on the Natural History of Guiana, p. 308.

reasoning faculty; for he would conclude, from comparing the motions of nature with his own, that there must be a principle, which performed and directed those motions, infinitely superior, both in wisdom and power, to that principle within him, which produced and directed his motions.

But, as from the study of himself man formed the idea of a God, it was natural, and indeed necessary, that he should suppose the God, of whom he had formed an idea in the manner I have described, to be a being such as himself, compounded of body and mind, though very much superior to him in both; for he was not yet so far advanced in the exercise of intellect, as to have formed an idea of a pure intellectual substance. And, accordingly, we find, that all the Gods of the Greeks, as they are described by Homer, had bodies as well as minds; but these very much superior to those of men*: And in general all the Heathen Gods were supposed to be beings of that kind, and were so represented in their statues. But those Gods of the antients were truly no more Gods than the men whom they were pleased to deify; for a God must be a pure immaterial substance, entirely separated from matter or body. Now, to conceive distinctly such a substance, requires a great effort of the human intellect. Every idea, as I have elsewhere observed*, must at first be formed by abstraction: And as all our ideas are first formed from the objects of sense, which are the source of all our knowledge in this state of our existence, it is necessary that we should form the idea of an immaterial substance, by abstracting from body all its qualities of shape and figure, of solidity and resistance, and even of parts. Of this kind of abstraction, Euclid has given us an example in the definitions, which he has prefixed to his Elements, where he

VOL. IV.

3 A

separates

* It is a very good description which Homer gives of the Greek Gods in the following line.

Τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ μῆτρον ἄστρων, τιμὴν τε, βίην τε.

† Page 17. of this volume.

separates a Surface from a Solid, Length from Breadth, and both from what he calls a *point*, which he says is without parts. But a Point has position, and occupies space; whereas an immaterial substance occupies no space: So that we must make one abstraction more than Euclid has made. And at the same time that we conceive it so different from body, we must also conceive it to be of much greater excellence, not only operating in a way quite different from body, but doing things which it is impossible that body can do.

That men must have been far advanced in arts and sciences before they could have made such abstractions, and formed an idea of a substance so remote from body, and of such superior excellence, is evident. Even the Greeks, when they were so far advanced not only in arts and civility, but in science and philosophy, as to have formed a school of philosophy, called the *Ionick* school, of which Thales was the founder, had not, in that school, got the idea of such an immaterial substance as I have described, who formed and governed this universe: For the first philosophers in Greece, were all materialists, as Aristotle informs us, till Anaxagoras arose among them, who first employed mind and intelligence to set every thing in order, and therefore, says Aristotle, talked like a sober man among babbling drunkards*. He was a successor of Thales; but at that time the school was above 100 years old. He, however, still retained so much of the prejudices of the more antient philosophy, that after things were once arranged and disposed, he supposed that they went on by matter and mechanism, and accounted, as Plato informs us†, for all the phaenomena of nature, from vapours, æthers, and subtile fluids.

In this respect he very much resembled some of our modern philosophers, particularly Sir Isaac Newton, who accounts in that way for

* See preface to Vol. III. of this work, p. 12.

† See Vol. I. of this work, p. 276.

for all the motions in the universe, even the motions of his own body; nor, indeed, does he appear to have had any idea of motion by mind. But, as he acknowledged the existence of a supreme intelligence, governing this universe, he cannot be said to be an Athiest, any more than Anaxagoras; but, I think, he was as much a materialist.

That Sir Isaac had not, as I have said, so much as the idea of mind moving body, is evident from the different causes which he has assigned for attraction or gravitation, *which, he says, proceeds from the action of bodies tending towards one another, or from spirits emitted from those bodies agitating one another, or from the action of æthers, air, or some medium corporeal or incorporeal, impelling the bodies swimming in it towards one another* *. Now, I think, it is impossible to believe, that a man who had any conception of mind moving body, should have assigned so many strange causes for that motion, some of them, I think, not intelligible. But as he did not believe that his own body was moved by mind, of which we have as strong a proof as we can have of any thing, I mean *consciousness*, it was no wonder he did not believe that any other body was so moved.

Further, he says, that not only our animal motions, but our sensations, are produced by material causes, such as æthers and subtile fluids. And, I think, there was nothing, that, upon his principles, should have hindered him from maintaining that our ideas, as well as our sensations, were produced by material causes, according to an antient philosopher of the name of Strato †. And here I must observe, that Sir Isaac has, in one particular, carried his materialism farther than Thales, the founder of the Ionic school: For Thales admitted that the mag-

* Vol. II. of this work, p. 324.

† Vol. III. of *ibid.* p. 322.

net and the iron were moved towards one another by mind; whereas, according to the principles of Sir Isaac's philosophy, I think, it is evident, that he believed no body to be moved in that way: So that it is æthers and subtile fluids, which, according to his philosophy, move magnetic, electrical, and chemical bodies; and move them every way, not only towards one another, but from one another; and give them that very extraordinary motion, which is perceived in some chemical bodies, and has so much of the operation of mind in it, that it is called *elective attraction*; as by it the body, quitting one body with which it had joined itself, attaches itself to another.

I have said a great deal of the philosophy of Sir Isaac Newton in the three first volumes of this work, to which I refer the reader, if he would desire to know more concerning it; and he may also read some queries, upon the subject, which I have put in volume V. of the Origin and Progress of Language *. But, I think, I have said enough here to convince him, that Sir Isaac did not clearly understand the nature of an immaterial substance, and particularly of that immaterial substance which is the author, originally or immediately, of all the motions in this universe.

As I have shown in what country arts and sciences had their origin, I think it is proper, that I should also give an account where religion began. And it is my opinion, that it began in the same country where arts and sciences had their origin; with which, religion, as I have shown, is necessarily connected. This country is Egypt; and if the reader be convinced, by what I have said, that man is not capable of religion, till he has formed civil society, and has made some progress in the use of intellect, more than is necessary for the invention and practice of the necessary arts of life; and

* Page 419—422.

if,

if, at the same time, I have convinced him, that Egypt was the first country in which a regular polity was formed, and arts and sciences invented and cultivated, he can have no doubt that it was also the first country of religion. This Herodotus has told us, who has said, that the Egyptians were the first who gave names to the Gods, and erected temples, altars, and statues, to them *: And Lucian, in his treatise *De Dea Syriae*, has told us, that the Egyptians were the first of men who had any idea of Gods, built temples to them, and instituted Panegyries, and other solemn assemblies in their honour.

There were in Egypt, as I have elsewhere observed †, two religions; the one, a philosophical religion, which was the religion of the Priests, and which they must have learned from their Dæmon Kings; the other the vulgar religion of the country, the objects of which were those Dæmons themselves, whom the Priests set up as the Gods that the people were to worship.

That this popular religion of Egypt went to the Greeks, who got even the names of the Gods from them, is a fact that cannot be disputed. But it was only the names that went to Greece, for the persons of the Egyptian Gods, that is of their Dæmon Kings, never went to Greece. But the Greek Gods were Greeks, to whom they gave the names, and ascribed the adventures, of the Egyptian Gods. It is also, I think, certain, that the religion of Egypt went to India, along with their polity and their other institutions. And Sir William Jones has discovered, that it travelled in the East as far as China and Japan, where, he says, there are statues to be seen, at this day, of Isis the Egyptian goddess, who is still known, even in those countries, by that name. And besides those statues of Isis, there are busts

* Euterpe, Cap. 4.

† Page 165. of this volume.

of black woolly haired men, which are to be seen in the countries that I have mentioned, which must, I think, be memorials of Egyptians, who taught them religion, as well as arts and sciences*. And though religion, as practised in Egypt, may not have gone to any other country, except those that I have mentioned, yet I am persuaded, that the idea of Gods, and superior powers, was propagated to other countries in the same manner as their language was: For, though language did not go to other countries as it was spoken in Egypt, yet those other countries got from Egypt the idea of forming articulate sounds, and so made a language of their own, with a mixture, no doubt, of some words which they may have heard spoken by the Egyptians, or by people who had learned to speak from the Egyptians; and, in the same manner, other nations may have formed a religion different from the Egyptian, though in imitation of it.

One general observation to be made, upon the religion of those very antient times, is, that it always supposes a plurality of Gods; for, when religion was first established among men, they were not so far advanced in the use and exercise of intellect, as to have the idea of one supreme God, who governed this universe, and of whom all those other beings, whom they called Gods, were only the ministers.

As men formed their first ideas of Gods from the study and knowledge of themselves, they would, as was natural, make them after their own image. And, accordingly, they gave them, as I have said, not only minds, but bodies, and consequently organs of sense, by which they saw and heard, and had other perceptions of sense. And they must have supposed, too, that their minds were such as their own, in this respect, that their favours were to be gained by all the

marks

* See this enlarged upon in p. 307 of this volume. † Page 163. of this volume.

marks of honour and respect they could show them, and particularly by offerings. These, at first, were the fruits of the earth, and particularly the first fruits of every year. Of this, the memory was preserved in Egypt in later times, when they presented to the goddess, Isis, handfulls of the first fruits of the corn of every year. And, in Greece, the memory of those bloodless offerings was preserved in the island of Delos, where, in later times, there was still to be seen an altar that never had been stained with blood, upon which, they offered nothing to the Gods except the fruits of the earth. But, when men began to eat flesh, and esteemed it the most valuable part of diet, it was natural that they should present to their Gods sacrifices of animals. And this was thought so much a religious duty, that, of every animal, which they killed for eating, some part was offered to the Gods, and this part they offered before they began to eat of the animal: So that it was a kind of *primitiae*, which they threw into the fire and burnt as an offering to the Gods, calling it *θυσλλον*. And hence it is, that in the language of Homer, to kill a beast for eating, is said to be *ἱεραειν*, that is to sacrifice it. And by the law of Moses it was enjoined, that every man, that killed an ox, a lamb, or a goat, should bring it to the door of the tabernacle, to offer it as an offering to the Lord; and this is enjoined under the pain of death*. And they not only courted their favour, by sacrificing single animals at different times, but by hecatombs of them at one time, upon some particular occasions. And, as the more precious the animal was, they thought the sacrifice to the Gods would be the more acceptable, they carried the matter so far, in some nations, that they sacrificed even animals of their own species, and sometimes their own children, which, as they were the dearest to them of all things, they thought would be the most acceptable to the Gods. And as these Gods had the sense of smell, as well as other senses, they imagined that they would be pleased with

* *Leviticus*, chap. 17. v. 3. &c.

with the smell of their burnt offerings*, which ascended to the skies, where they supposed they resided. And, as their sacrifices were accompanied with music, they thought that the ears of their Gods were entertained in that way, as their sight was by magnificent temples, altars, pomps, and processions, and by numberless rites and ceremonies which accompanied the antient worship. And the legislators, and magistrates, in some countries, particularly in Egypt, very much encouraged a worship of so much pomp and show, and accompanied by so many rites and ceremonies, because they thought it was the only way to preserve religion among the people, who must be attached to it by their senses, and not by their reason.

In return for these oblations, and their devotion to their Gods; they expected success in their wars, and in all the occupations in which they were employed; and, as the success of these depended very much upon their knowledge of future events, they expected that their Gods were to inform them of these by prophecies, dreams, oracles, auspices; or the entrails of beasts, and by augury, that is, the flight of birds. And in this way a kind of intercourse and commerce was carried on betwixt those antient men and their Gods.

As the Jews were a people as much or more governed by their senses than any other nation, it was necessary that Moses should establish among them a religion, of as much pomp and splendor, and of as many rites and ceremonies, as any of the Heathen religions. And there was another reason also, that the people, who had been so long in Egypt, and so much accustomed to a religion of that kind, could never have been made converts to a religion so simple as that of their ancestors the Patriarchs; but if Moses had attempted to give them such a religion, they would have revolted, and become idolaters, like the Egyptians and the other neighbouring nations.

Moses,

* *Leviticus*, chap. 17. v. 6.

Moses, therefore, was obliged to allow them temples, altars, sacrifices, and all the pomp and show, rites and ceremonies, that were practised in Egypt and in other countries. And our Scripture tells us, that, on account of the hardness of their hearts, and their violent propensity to the idolatry of other nations, God gave them laws, which were not good, but to which it was necessary to subject them *. This reason for the Mosaical religious institutions is very well enforced by Spencer, in his most learned work, *De Legibus Hebræorum*; where he has shown, I think, very evidently, that a more simple religion never could have been adopted by a people so grossly sensual as the Jews.

It is this character of the Jewish nation, their attachment to the pleasures of the body and the things of this world, without appearing to have the least idea of a life to come, which, I am persuaded, was the reason why that *life and immortality*, which was afterwards revealed by our Saviour to them and to all mankind, was no part of the Mosaical religion. If he had preached to them that they were to live after their death, they not only would not have believed him, but it would have discredited all the rest of his doctrine, as much as the abolishing the sacrifices, and the whole ritual of the Egyptians and other Heathen nations, would have done. Moses, therefore, accommodated himself in this, as well as in other parts of his legislation, to the genius of the people, with whom he had to deal, to the *hardness of their hearts*, and, I think I may add, to the dulness of their understandings †. I think, therefore, Bishop War-

VOL. IV.

3 B

burton

* 'Because they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes, and had polluted my Sabbaths, and their eyes were after their fathers idols; Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live'. Ezekiel, chap. 20. v. 24.

† Josephus, *contra Apionem*, (lib. 2.), tells us that one Apollonius said of them, that they were ἀφρονταί ται βάρβαροι, the *dullest of all Barbarians*; and that they alone had

burton needed not have given himself so much trouble to account for that singularity of the legislation of Moses, that he did not enforce the religion he taught the Jews, by rewards and punishments in a future life, as was done by other legislators of antient nations, which had cultivated their understandings more, and had made greater progress in arts and sciences.

While men were yet in the natural state, or but little advanced in civil life, and consequently had made little or no progress in the cultivation of arts and sciences, by which the human intellect is improved, and made fit to form the idea of the Supreme Being, the state of religion could not, I think, have been other than such as I have described *. But after arts were further improved, sciences invented, and carried up to philosophy, and even to the summit of philosophy, I mean theology, religion began to wear a new face.

That

had never invented any thing useful for human life. And even the Fathers of the Christian church give the same account of them; particularly St Basil, in the first of his *Hexamers*, says, That it was probable that there was something existing before the Mosaic world, but Moses did not relate it, because it would not have been intelligible *τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις* *et, qui tunc erant rei ymperii*; that is, to his own countrymen, who were to be considered as *infants yet in understanding, and only beginning to learn*. And to the same purpose, St Chrysostom, in his Second Discourse upon *Genesis*, says, That Moses, in giving an account of the beginning of things to the Jews, who were unable to comprehend any thing of a spiritual or intellectual nature, addressed himself to their senses; at which, says he, we ought not to be surprised, as he was speaking *τοῖς ἁπλοῦσι Ἰουδαίοις*, to the Jews, the dullest of men. See upon this subject Burnet's *Archæologia*, p. 469. and 470. See further, upon the subject of the Jews, what Lactantius, a Christian author who lived under Constantine the Emperor, in his *Institutes*, (Lib. 4. Cap. 2.) says of them; That Pythagoras, and after him Plato and others, went every where in search of knowledge, to Egypt particularly, but not to the Jews. This shows the mistake of those authors who have advanced that Plato learned the doctrine of the Trinity from the Jews; and, indeed, if Plato had gone among them to learn philosophy, they could not have revealed to him that mystery, which was no part of the doctrine, that Moses taught the Jews.

* Page 368. and 374.

That all arts, sciences, and philosophy, came originally from Egypt, I have proved to the satisfaction, I hope, of my readers. They were all very much cultivated there, and particularly philosophy, which, as it contains the principles of all sciences, may be fitly called the *science of sciences*. And as they were so religious a people, it would have been very extraordinary if they had not applied their philosophy to religion: But this they did; and accordingly they had a philosophical religion as well as a popular *. Of their popular religion I have already spoken, and shown, that it went to Greece, and to other countries. But as to their philosophical religion, it was only the religion of the philosophers in Egypt, and was kept as a mystery from the rest of the people. It went, however, to Greece, but still in the shape of a mystery; for it was communicated to some few of the learned Greeks who came to Egypt, and they communicated it to a very few chosen men of their country, under the seal of inviolable secrecy; and the doctrines of this religion made what they called the *mysteries*, greater and lesser. Of these mysteries Bishop Warburton has given us a very full and accurate account, (for which, I think, the learned world is much obliged to him), in his first volume of the *Divine Legation of Moses*. They came to Greece from Egypt, as Dr Warburton tells us; and, indeed, they could come from no other country: And they maintained, first, the doctrine of one God; then, an antecedent state of man, in which he was much happier than in his present state, and which, I find, is also mentioned by Jamblichus, the Alexandrian philosopher, in his work *De Mysteriis* †; and likewise a future state of rewards and punishments: And to those who were initiated into the greater mysteries, who were very few, it was revealed, that the Gods of the popular religion were mere mortal men.

* Page 165. and 373. of this vol.

† Page 176.

This was the most perfect system, of natural religion, that ever was among men, containing, as we have seen, the fundamental doctrines of our revealed religion; nor do I think, that human reason, even cultivated as it was among the Egyptians by arts and sciences, could have gone farther.

To those, who were initiated into the greater mysteries, (which was not till four years after their initiation into the lesser; for these were considered as only a preparation for the greater*), was revealed that great mystery of the Unity of God; and that all the Gods of the Greeks and Romans were mere mortal men;—a truth, which the Egyptians did only reveal to those who were to govern the state, and not even to all the Priests, but only to those who were most approved of for their education and learning†. Those who were admitted to the greater mysteries, were accounted the happiest of men; and were said to be born again, and to begin a new life, being reclaimed from an irrational and savage life, and *cultivated and mitigated into humanity*, as Cicero expresses it; from whence, he says, these mysteries were called *initia*, being *re vera principia vitae, the beginning of a truly rational life*; and making us live not only pleasantly in this life, but giving us the hopes of a better life hereafter‡. Isocrates, in his *Panegyric*, says, that the mysteries are the things which human nature principally stands in need of§. And Plato has said, that the design of Initiation was to restore the soul to that state from whence it fell, as from its native state of perfection||. And Proclus, the Alexandrian philosopher, tells us, that the mysteries and initiations drew the

* See Warburton's *Divine Legation*, Vol. I. p. 182.

† Ibid. p. 190.

‡ Cicero, *De Legibus*, Lib. 2. Cap. 14.—Warburton, *ubi supra*, p. 210.

§ Warburton, *ubi supra*, p. 213. where he has given us other passages from antient authors, showing the happiness which the initiated enjoy.

|| Plato, in *Phaedone*; and Warburton, p. 172.

the souls of men from a material, sensual, and merely human life, and joined them in communion with God. And not only did the initiated enjoy intellectual pleasures, greater than other men, but even the pleasures of body, which nature bestows on us, such as the *light of the sun**.

And here it may not be improper to observe, that the Egyptians not only invented those arts, without which men could not have lived in civil society, but also, that we owe to them sciences and philosophy, in which they appear to have excelled all the nations that ever existed;—Further, that they applied their philosophy to the most useful purpose in human life, the framing a good form of polity, the best that ever existed. And, lastly, when to arts, sciences, and philosophy, they added such a religion, by which they provided for the happiness of men in the life to come, as much as they could do by the light of natural reason, must we not allow that the wisdom of the Egyptians deserves all the praise which our Scripture and the antient Greek writers bestow on it†, and that they were truly a wonderful people, worthy of being chosen by providence to be the inventors, the depositaries, and the propagators, of arts and sciences all over the world.

This philosophical religion of Egypt was not only communicated to certain philosophers of Greece, but it was, by some of those philosophers, committed to writing, particularly by Plato, who has given us the same pure system of Theism, revealed to the initiated in the mysteries, also the pre-existent and more perfect state of man, and a future state of rewards and punishments. There was, however, one of the doctrines of the mysteries, that he has thought proper not to publish, for a reason which may be easily guessed;—That all the deities worshipped by the people were mere men.

There

* Ibid. p. 175.

† Page 135.

There was one mystery, however, known to the Egyptians, though not communicated to the Greeks in their initiations, but which Plato learned in Egypt, though he did not publish it in his writings, keeping it as a mystery which he revealed to a very few of his followers. The doctrine, I mean, is, that of the Trinity. But, though kept as a secret by Plato while he lived, it has been published since his death, and is to be found in some of the writings of the philosophers of the Alexandrian school, who, I believe, had a traditional knowledge of the philosophy both of Plato and Aristotle; and, besides, we are sure that they had the use of books, upon the subject of philosophy, which are now lost. The first person of Plato's Trinity, he calls the *πρωτος θεος*, and who, he says, is *ὑπερουσιος*, that is, *above*, or *superior*, to all being. And, however extraordinary this appellation may appear, I think it is perfectly just; for, as all being has proceeded from him, he must be superior to all being, and something different from being, as the cause must be different from the effect. The second person of Plato's Trinity is, the *Νους*, or, as it is called in the New Testament, *λογος*, a word which, in classical Greek, expresses what is different from *Νους*: For it denotes the operation of the *Νους*, either internally in thinking or reasoning, or externally in speech; so that it is either the *λογος ενδιαιτος*, or *λογος προφορικος*. But if the use of the word *λογος*, in our New Testament, be not classical, the translation we have given of it, by the term *word*, is still much further removed from the word *Νους*, which ought to be translated by the English word *intellect*; whereas we have translated it by the term *word*, that is, an articulate sound, uttered by the human mouth, significant of any of our ideas. This is a translation most absurd, and which makes the doctrine of the Trinity quite unintelligible. But to return to Plato.—This second person of the Trinity he calls the *θεος δημιουργος*, and this appellation is perfectly agreeable to our Scripture; for it says, that by the Son, which is the name it gives to the second person of the Trinity, *all things were made*,
and

and without him nothing was made. The third person of Plato's Trinity is the *ψυχή του κόσμου*, that is, the animating spirit of the Universe, called, in our Scripture language, the Πνεύμα ἅγιον, and which, in our translation, we call the *Holy Ghost*, a strange name for the *Holy Spirit*; by which all things in the Universe, formed by intelligence, that is, the second person of the Trinity, have life and action, and without which the whole creation would be an inanimate mass.

That this Platonic doctrine of the Trinity is the same with the Christian, I think is evident, and such was the opinion of the fathers of the church*.

Dr Warburton, in his second volume of the *Divine Legation*, maintains, that the Greek philosophers did not believe in those religious doctrines I have mentioned, communicated to the initiated in the mysteries, particularly not in a state of future rewards and punishments, which they considered as a doctrine very useful in society, and, therefore, were at pains to inculcate it, though they did not believe it. But, though all the philosophers of Greece did not believe in a future state of rewards and punishments, particularly the Epicureans, who entirely denied the providence of God, and whose Gods they said took no concern in human affairs; and though some of the other philosophers do not appear to have had a firm belief upon that point, yet I cannot be persuaded, that the initiated in the mysteries did not believe the doctrines they learned in those mysteries; and much less can I be persuaded, that the Egyptian Priests, from whom the Greeks got those mysteries, did not themselves believe in them, but meant to impose upon the credulity of the Greeks, for what purpose is not easy to say. The Egyptians,

* See St Cyrillus in his 3d book *against the Emperor Julian*; and Eusebius, *Præparatio Evangelica*, Cap. 14.—20. See also what I have further written upon the subject of the Trinity, Vol. I. *Origin of Language*, p. 7. 2d edition.—Vol. V. p. 338. and 344. and Vol. III. of this work, p. 22.

tians, as Herodotus tells us, first discovered the immortality of the soul; and, I think, by the natural light of reason, especially a reason so much cultivated as theirs, by arts and sciences, the Egyptians, if they applied their philosophy to religion, which they certainly did, and had a philosophical as well as a popular religion, must have discovered, even without the assistance of their Dæmon Kings, not only the immortality of the soul, as Herodotus tells us they did, and a future state of rewards and punishments, but all the other doctrines, which they communicated to the initiated.

Besides this doctrine of the Trinity, Plato, as I have observed *, maintained a pre-existent state of man, and a future state of rewards and punishments; and consequently he must have believed in the immortality of the soul: And the same appears to have been the doctrine of Aristotle, who has told us, that our intellectual mind is never in so perfect a state as when it exists by itself, disencumbered of the body.

This religious philosophy went from Greece to Italy, where it was much cultivated among the Romans; so that the religion of the philosophers of Egypt, that is the Priests, was in this way spread over a considerable part of Europe. But still the popular religion of all the nations of the earth, (the Jews only excepted), continued to be gross idolatry; for they worshipped Gods of flesh and blood, and who had all the passions belonging to men, and many of their vices, in which their worshippers, as was natural, were disposed to imitate them. Then it was a most bloody religion, being accompanied with the slaughter of so many of the animal race, which must have been very offensive to a gracious God, who desires the preservation of all that race, as far as is consistent with the general system of nature. With such a religion, it was impossible that a people could be happy in

in this, or the next world, whatever the case of a few philosophers, among them, might have been. A better popular religion, therefore, was of absolute necessity for the happiness of man. Although the popular religion of Egypt, which had come first to Greece, and from thence to the other nations of Europe, still continued to be the religion of the people of these nations, I am persuaded, however, that the opinions of the philosophers must have been known to many of them, though they did not apply themselves particularly to philosophy, and must have had an influence upon their minds, so as to dispose them to receive a better religion.

In this state was religion when our Saviour appeared on this earth. While men were in the state of nature, and wandering about solitary, and even when they were associated in herds, they could not, as I have shown*, have the idea of a God; nor even in the first ages of civility could they form any proper idea of the Supreme Being: So that when we find a nation in that situation, having any such idea of God, we should conclude that it got the idea from some more civilised nation, with which it had an intercourse. Such was the case of the nations of North America, and of the people of Guiana in South America †. But when arts and sciences had made some progress among men, their understanding was thereby so much improved, that they formed the idea of beings existing superior to themselves. But their notions of such beings were, as I have shown, very gross, and they made them, as was natural, very like to themselves ‡. But when they had made farther progress in arts and sciences, and had ascended to philosophy, and even to the highest part of it, theology, not only the philosophers would be disposed to embrace a better religion, but even the vulgar, from what they must have heard of the opinions of the learned among them, would listen to

VOL. IV.

3 C

the

* See p. 367. of this Vol.

† Ibid. p. 368.

‡ Page 384.

the doctrines of that better religion, which would show them, at the same time, the absurdities of the religion they professed.

Thus it appears, that the Christian religion is founded upon principles of philosophy, such as are formed from the study of nature; and, indeed, I think it would be absurd, and even impious, to maintain that there is any thing in it contrary to the established order of nature and the system of the universe. But, so far from that, it is a most philosophical religion, much more so than any other religion that ever was in the world; and it was fit it should be so, as philosophy was so far advanced in the world; nor could the philosophers have believed in it, if it had not been founded on principles of philosophy. The mystery of the Trinity is, as I shall show in the next volume, not only a very great mystery of religion, but of philosophy, as it not only explains to us the nature of the Divinity, but leads to the knowledge of such a system in the universe, as to a man, who is philosopher enough to comprehend it, must appear astonishing. And it was necessary that this mystery should be revealed to Christians, as, without having the nature of the Divinity thus explained, they could not comprehend how our Saviour should be the Son of God, nor could they have any idea of the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit.

That this mystery of the Trinity was revealed to the apostles; cannot, I think, be doubted, as they were not philosophers, and therefore could not discover it themselves. But, I believe, the Egyptians did themselves, with the assistance of their Dæmon Kings; make this great discovery in philosophy, which ascends to the very summit of theology. This discovery they communicated to Plato; and their was another discovery of theirs, which they also communicated to Plato, I mean the doctrine of *ideas*. This doctrine I have no doubt that Plato brought with him from Egypt, as well

as that of the Trinity, with which I shall show that it has a necessary connection, and that both together make a wonderful chain of beings, reaching from the first person of the Trinity, the source of all being, to the lowest beings in the Universe.

But there was one truth, and a truth of great importance, which was revealed by our Saviour to the world, but was not known to the Egyptian or Greek philosophers. It was this: They knew there was to be a future state of rewards and punishments, and a new world, or renovation of things, a *παλιγγενεσις*, as they called it; but when this was to happen, whether soon or in some very remote period, they knew not. But our Saviour let his disciples know that it was not far off; and one of the chief purposes of his mission appears to have been to give this information to the human race, that they might be prepared for the change in their state, which was to happen soon, by repenting and turning from their evil ways. That this was part of the revelation of our Saviour, is clearly proved by many texts both in the apostles and the epistles*.

From the account I have given of the philosophy of the Christian religion, it is evident that it was a religion fitted for a learned age, such as the age of Augustus Cæsar; but could not have been propagated in an unlearned age. Such an age, the apostle Paul, in his speech to the Areopagus, calls the *times of ignorance*†. At these

3 C 2

times,

* St Math. chap. 16. v. 28.—St Mark, chap. 9. v. 1.—St Luke, chap. 9. v. 27.—Ibid. chap. 21. v. 32.—St John, chap. 21. v. 22.—1st Corinth. chap. 15. v. 51.—1st Thessalon. chap. 4. v. 15. From these texts it may seem wonderful, that this great event has not happened in the space of 1800 years. But this is no reason to make us believe that it is never to happen; *For a thousand years in the sight of God are as one day*. That this world, or at least the race of man in it, is drawing to an end, is, as I shall show in the sequel of this work, a truth of philosophy, and to be proved both by reason and argument, and by fact and observation.

† Acts of the Apostles, chap. 17. v. 30.

times, he says, that *God winked*, by which, I understand, he means, that he allowed men to go on in this gross idolatry, as they were then capable of no better religion. *But now he commandeth all men every where to repent*, that is, to renounce their idolatrous religion, and to receive a better. And, accordingly, in this speech, St Paul gives the Athenians a system of genuine theism, telling them, *that there was one God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with mens hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us: For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art and mans device. Of this God it appears, that even the vulgar, and those of the popular religion in Athens, had some idea; for St Paul informs us, that they had erected an altar, with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD, who, St Paul says, was the God that he declared unto them.*

Having laid down in this manner the general principles of Theism, he says nothing of the particular doctrines of Christianity except in one verse*, where he says, *that God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.* And here St Paul tells us, that when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, *some mocked, and others*

* Acts of the Apostles, chap. 17. v. 31.

others said, *we will bear thee again of this matter.* And certainly the resurrection of the body is not a truth of natural religion, nor of philosophy; though I think it is highly probable, that the Egyptians believed in it, as I cannot account for the extraordinary care they took to preserve the bodies of their dead, otherwise than by supposing, that they believed they were to inhabit them again. But, I think, there can be no doubt, that to his converts, particularly Dionysius the Areopagite, Paul explained and inculcated the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, such as that of the Trinity, with the knowledge of which, as Paul was no philosopher, I must suppose that he was inspired. The *eternal generation of the Son of God*, so that the Son is co-eternal with the Father, is another fundamental doctrine of Christianity. It is a necessary consequence of the doctrine of the Trinity, and would be easily explained to men who had the least tincture of philosophy, and could distinguish the productions of natural and temporary things, from the productions of things divine and eternal: Of *those*, the cause producing is always prior to the production; whereas, of *these*, the cause producing and the production being both eternal, the production must be coeval with the cause. A third fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion is, *the incarnation of the Son of God.* But this would be still more easily explained to a man who knew so much of himself as to know that he was compounded of three natures, the vegetable, the animal, and the intellectual. To these three it is not difficult to conceive, that a fourth might be added,—the divine. The first three made Jesus Christ a man, and a man only, but the fourth made him more than man, and the Saviour of the world. And this, I think, is sufficient to show, that the Christian religion is a learned and philosophical religion, fit for the age in which it was brought into the world.

These are the doctrines which, I suppose, St Paul taught his disciples
in

in private, though he did not communicate them to the people of Athens in the Areopagus. But there is one fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and of Theism in general, with which he sets out in his speech to that assembly; and that was the Unity of the God-head: *There was one God*, he says, *that made the world and all things therein; seeing he is Lord of heaven and earth, &c.* And *this was*, he says, *the unknown God, to whom they had erected an altar, and who was the God that he declared unto them.* By this doctrine, of one God, St Paul meant to put an end to that Polytheism, which was universal in all the Heathen nations, and particularly among the Athenians, *who*, as St Paul says, *were too superstitious*; more so, I think, than other Heathen nations, as appears from the altar dedicated *To the unknown God*; such as, I believe, was not to be found in any other nation in the world. Of this altar St Paul makes a very good use, and lets them know, that the unknown God, to whom they dedicated the altar, was the one God, who had made the heaven and earth, and all things therein. And it was, as I have said, a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, that Jesus came from this one God, not to establish different religions in different countries, but to give one religion to all mankind, by which they were to be saved, if they would embrace that religion, and conform themselves to the precepts of it: So that the mission of Jesus was not, like the mission of Moses, to one people, but to all the people of the earth; and, therefore, the world, in consequence of this mission, as it had but one God, was to have but one religion; and not to be divided into many local and territorial religions, of which there were many different deities even in the same country.

I am now to show, that it was not only a learned, philosophical religion, but a religion for the people, and more fitted to make them virtuous and happy, both in this life and the next, than any religion that ever was among men;—In short, that it was a popular religion
of

of the best kind possible, a religion that was entirely wanting on this earth, as I have observed, when our Saviour came to it.

The fundamental principle of this *practical* religion, as it may be called, is the love of God and of man. We are commanded *to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, and with all our souls, and with all our strengths, and with all our minds, and our neighbour as ourselves* *. Where the reader may observe, from the number of words employed in delivering this precept, how earnestly it is enforced. And again our Saviour, when he takes leave of his disciples, says, *A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another* †. By this being called *a new commandment*, I understand is meant, that it was not commanded by any other religion then in the world: And, accordingly, it is added in the following verse, *By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another*; which is plainly saying, that this love was the distinguishing mark of their religion. The Christian religion is, therefore, more a religion of love, than any religion that is, or ever was, in the world ‡. Now, love is the noblest of all our passions; for the object of it is beauty, worth, and goodness, in short, every quality that is estimable or amiable: And the greatest happiness we can enjoy in this life,

* Luke, chap. 10. v. 27.

† St John, chap. 13. v. 34.

‡ See what I have further said of this predominant quality in the Christian religion in Vol. IV. of *Origin of Language*, p. 367. and following; where several other texts of the New Testament are quoted to prove it; and particularly, 1st Corinth. chap. 13. where the word *αγαπη*, which signifies *Love*, is very improperly expressed in our translation by the word *Charity*. Now, of the three Christian virtues, *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, or *Love*, as it should be translated, *Love* is the greatest. (1st Corinth. chap. 13. v. 13.) And one text is quoted, p. 370. which says, *That perfect love casteth out fear*. Now, the object of such a love, can be nothing but *beauty*: or *the beauty of holiness*, as it is called in our Scripture language.

life, is to love and to be loved; and yet the depravity of men, in modern times, is such, that this religion of love has given occasion to persecutions, civil wars, murders, and massacres, such as no religion, in antient times, ever produced *; which has made our Saviour say, *That he came not to bring peace to the earth, but a sword* †.

There is another fundamental tenet of the Christian religion, and which contains a most important truth, both of religion and philosophy, being that upon which the happiness of man in the next world must depend, and I may add also in this. It is this, that we are but sojourners or passengers in this life, and that, therefore, we can expect no fixed or permanent happiness in it, but must look foreward to the next, where we must be happy or miserable according to our behaviour here. This is a doctrine which our Saviour very much inculcates, telling his disciples again and again, *That his kingdom was not of this world*; and it is a doctrine that would be readily listened to by philosophers, who believed in the immortality of the soul, and in a future state of rewards and punishments. Plato says that the chief subject of the meditation of a philosopher, and, as I understand him, the most pleasant subject, is *death*, by which he is to be disencumbered of this prison of flesh and blood, and restored to the enjoyment of his intellectual mind, without being

* See the works of the Emperor Julian, Epist. 52. where we have an account of men having their estates confiscated, being driven into exile, and many of them put to death, on account of their religious belief; and, for the same reason, whole villages in several countries which he names, desolated and laid waste. And the subject of dispute was the mystery of the Trinity, of which it was impossible that the vulgar could think justly, or agree in opinion, if they thought of it at all. Even some of the Fathers of the church did not understand it; and particularly St Augustine, though he studied it very much, and has written 15 books upon the subject, was so far from understanding it, that, in his fifth book, *De Trinitate*, cap. 9. he says, that there were not three persons only in the Trinity, but that there might be any other number.

† St Math. chap. 10. v. 34.

being disturbed by the many wants and avocations of his animal life. *Death*, therefore, so far from being an object of terror to such a philosopher, is to be wished, and earnestly desired, by him. Of this, Plotinus, an Alexandrian philosopher, whose life Porphyry has written, was a remarkable example; for when he was advanced in years, but long before he died, he wished earnestly for death, though he would not use any means to procure it; thinking that he was bound to keep the station allotted to him in this life, as long as it pleased his Maker, who had put him there. And if an Heathen philosopher is not afraid to die, but on the contrary wishes it, much more will a good Christian: And, accordingly, St Paul calls out with a kind of enthusiasm, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death *."

Thus, I think, I have shown, that our Saviour came in fulness of time, as it is very well expressed in Scripture; that is, just when it was proper for him to come, and not sooner;—when men were so far advanced in arts, sciences, and philosophy, as to be able to comprehend, and be disposed to embrace, so sublime a religion. If he had come sooner, that is *in the days of ignorance*, as the apostle expresses it, I am persuaded the salvation he offered would not have been well received. This is evident from the difficulty that is found to make converts among the barbarous nations. The Moravian Missionaries were seven years in Greenland without making one convert; and, I am afraid, they have not yet made many. A company of them, as I am informed, went to Guinea; but they all died, without making one convert, as far as I could learn. But the Jews themselves furnish the strongest evidence of the necessity of arts and sciences, for making men fit to embrace the Christian religion. Jesus Christ lived among them and wrought very many miracles, sufficient, one should think, to have convinced the most obstinate un-

VOL. IV.

3 D

believers.

* Romans, chap. 7. v. 24.

believers. He suffered martyrdom also among them, and was raised from the dead. Yet the apostles made many fewer converts among them, than among any of the Gentiles: So far, indeed, from being converted themselves, they opposed most vehemently the progress of the apostles among the Gentiles, as is evident from many passages in the Acts of the Apostles, and particularly from one, where it is recorded, that when Paul was in Lystra, a city of Lycania in Asia, and was going on most successfully in converting the inhabitants, there came Jews from Antioch and Iconium, who raised the people against this apostle, *and having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead* *. And the reason was, that, being naturally a very dull people, as they are represented even by the fathers of the church, and altogether unlearned, they were so obstinately attached to the Mosaic law, and all its forms and ceremonies, (a yoke, which, as Peter said, in the council of the apostles and elders, neither they nor their forefathers were able to bear †, and which was imposed upon them, on account of the hardness of their hearts, and their propensity to idolatry), that they could not bear a religion which laid aside all those forms and ceremonies, so many in number, and required nothing but a worship from the heart in spirit and truth. And there was another doctrine of Christianity, to the belief of which, I am persuaded, they were averse; and that was, the immortality of the soul and a future state of rewards and punishments. This doctrine was not taught them by Moses, for the same reason that he did not teach them many other things, the hardness of their hearts, and the dulness of their understanding, which made them incapable to comprehend how they could live after they were dead. The promises, therefore, and threatnings in the Legislation of Moses, are all confined to the things of this life, which they could readily comprehend: Whereas the doctrine of the Gospel is quite the contrary;

* Acts of the Apostles, chap. 14. v. 19.

† Ibid. chap. 15. v. 10.

contrary; for by it we are directed, as I have said, to put our trust entirely in the life to come, and not at all in the things of this life. It was, therefore, to these only that the Jews looked, wishing and hoping that the kingdom of Israel should be restored to its antient independent situation, the greatest happiness they thought they could enjoy. And, at this day, when Christianity is the religion of Europe and of some part of Asia, they continue unbelievers, and are in the most singular situation that any nation ever was in; for they are dispersed, I may say, all over the world, and yet continue a nation without a country, and still obstinately attached to their religion, customs, and manners.

I have already observed*, that the Heathen religion, was very destructive of the animal race, by offering so many of them to be sacrificed to the Gods. This, I have said, must certainly have been very offensive to a wise and good God, who must be supposed to desire the preservation and happiness of the whole race of animals, as far as is consistent with the general system of nature. But as intelligence must always act according to system, and the Supreme Intelligence more than any other, so in the progress of man, in religion as well as in other things, we see that every thing went on in regular order; so that man could not at once attain to true religion, but must have formed one suitable to the degree of intelligence which he had acquired. And as there was nothing more natural than his believing that his offering to his Gods what he esteemed most valuable, would render them propitious, from thence arose those sacrifices of animals, even by hundreds, which he made, and burnt, that the odour might ascend to the skies, where he supposed the Gods dwelt.

This enormity God *winked at* (as the apostle says) in the days of ignorance, and tolerated even in his chosen people the Jews, among
3 D 2 whom

* Page 384.

whom very many animals were sacrificed upon different occasions; for this rite of worship was so universally practised among all the nations in their neighbourhood, and they had been so much accustomed to it while they were in Egypt, that, if Moses had prohibited it, they would not have received his laws, but would have conformed to the general practice, and have offered sacrifices to the idols of the nations. And Moses, in this as well as in many other articles, appears only to have changed the object of the worship, not the rites and ceremonies of it, as, I think, Spencer has very clearly shown in his work above quoted; and, indeed, I think, that, without changing the course of nature, and the general rules of the system of the human species, by which they must make a regular progress in religion, as well as in other things, God could not have acted otherwise with respect to the Jews.

But our Saviour having come *in the fulness of time*, when the minds of men, by the progress they had made in arts and sciences, were prepared to receive a better religion, sacrifices, as well as many other rites and ceremonies, were laid aside altogether, and a pure religion was established, by which the true God was to be worshipped in spirit and in truth, *not by the works of mens hands*, as the apostle says*. At the same time, I am not of opinion, that all the rites and ceremonies of the Pagan worship were ordained by the gospel to be laid aside. And particularly one part of their worship, I mean music, is very properly continued in the Christian church; not because we are to suppose that God is pleased or entertained with our music, but because music, if it be proper church music, must have a great effect upon the minds of men, (who must be governed more or less by their senses), in exciting them to devotion. And, accordingly, as I have elsewhere observed†, it was chiefly by music,

* Acts of the Apostles, chap. 17. v. 24. and 29.

† Page 95. and 101. of this vol.

music, that the most savage people we read of, the Paraguayse, were converted to Christianity; and, I am persuaded, if it were more used by the Missionaries, among the barbarous nations, they would succeed better.

As to the time when our Saviour came to establish his religion on this earth, I have observed that it was in the *fulness of time*, according to Scripture language, with respect to arts and sciences; and I will now show, that it was also in fulness of time with regard to the state of the human species at that time. That men are at present very much degenerated both in mind and body, and that they live in such a way that their numbers are daily decreasing, I think, I have clearly proved in the third volume of this work. As to numbers, I think, I will prove very clearly in the sequel of this work, that they are decreased, and continually decreasing so much, that, in not very many generations, the species must die out, though it were not to be destroyed by any convulsion of nature, such as is foretold in our sacred books. Now, this degeneracy of man, and desolation of the earth, was begun, and had gone on for many years, before the days of Augustus Cæsar. The great empires of the Assyrians, Medes, Persians, and Macedonians, no longer existed. Of all those antient empires, none remained but the Roman, which was established at a great expence of the human species, even in Italy itself, the seat of that empire; for Italy was so much depopulated, that colonies were brought from other countries to repeople it; and particularly Constantine the Emperor settled there 300,000 Sarmatians*. As to arts and sciences, they were likewise upon the decline. Egypt, once the fountain and seat of all arts and sciences, from which they were propagated all over the world, and which, at one time, was the best governed country that ever existed, had become, in the days of Augustus Cæsar, a Roman province, not famous for arts and sciences, nor for any thing else. Greece was no longer the

* Vol. V. of Origin of Language, p. 25.

country that it had been; and though its inhabitants still preserved arts and sciences among them to a certain degree, yet they were not such as had been in former times. And as to the Romans, what arts and sciences were among them, they had learned from the Greeks, but never carried them to such perfection as the Greeks did. With respect to the arts, they never had painters, statuaries, or sculptors, of any note; nor were they eminent in any science that I know: And as to philosophy, they had not so much as a school of it. Nor were men, at that time, improved in morals any more than in arts and sciences; but, on the contrary, there was a general corruption of manners, in every nation then known, more or less, and particularly among the Romans, as their own historians inform us. That things have grown better since the days of Augustus Cæsar, no body will affirm; but, on the contrary, vice and disease have greatly increased, and depopulation, within these last four or five hundred years, has gone on to a surprising degree, not only in the countries known in antient times, but in a new world unknown to the antients, there has been such depopulation, as there is no example of the like in the history of man. And as to arts and sciences, by learning those of the antient world, we confess how much we are fallen off in that article.

Such being the state of man at the time that our Saviour came to the world, it was very proper that he should let them know that there would be soon a change of this scene of man, for which they ought to prepare themselves by a religious and virtuous life: And to consider this life as a transient state of trial and probation, which was soon to have an end; and, therefore, not to look for any permanent happiness in it, but to put their trust in the life to come; which, as I have said*, is a principal doctrine of the Christian religion.

As

* Page 387. and 392.

As the Jews were a people chosen by God, and kept distinguished and separated from all other nations, and as they were the only people then on the earth, who believed in one God, the Creator of heaven and earth, it was proper that our Saviour should be of that nation: So that the prophecies, which foretold that the Messiah was to be of that nation, might be fulfilled in him. Accordingly, he was born in Jerusalem, and his mother, the Virgin Mary, was descended of the noblest race among them, the race of David, the King, who, with the rest of his countrymen, was descended of Abraham, to whom it was promised, *That in him should all families of the earth be blessed**. It was also fit, that the doctrine of Jesus should be first promulgated among the Jews, who believed in the one God, from whom it came; nor do I think, that, in any other nation, our Saviour could have found disciples to propagate his doctrine, first among the Jews, and then among the Gentiles.

As our Saviour said that he was the Son of God, miracles were necessary to support his high title, and give credit to his mission; and, accordingly, he wrought many miracles, and in the view of all the people, and which were all works of beneficence, showing divine goodness, as well as divine power. And he concluded them all by raising himself from the dead, after he had been crucified by the Jews, contrary to the inclination, as appeared, of the Roman governor, Pontius Pilate; but he, in this, submitted to the will of the Jews, who could not bear any other religion than that of Moses. After his death and resurrection, his disciples, who had also the power of working miracles bestowed upon them, and had a very great miracle exhibited in their own persons, I mean the gift of tongues, which was necessary to propagate their religion among the Gentiles, laboured very much in their calling, and were very successful in making converts among the Gentiles, much more successful than among their own countrymen, who, as I have observed,

* Genesis, chap. 12. v. 3.

ed, did all they could to stop their progress. But besides the miracles they wrought, and their gift of tongues, they were assisted by the Holy Spirit, which animated them, and some of their converts, and made them go on so successfully, that, in not very many years, a considerable part of Greece and Italy was converted to Christianity.

As to the general state of religion of this earth at present, I have already observed, that Christianity is the religion of Europe; for even where the Turks are the Sovereigns, the Christian religion is prevalent. It also prevails in several parts of Asia, and even in Egypt, particularly in the country about Alexandria, where they have a Patriarch; and have joined together Judaism and Christianity in one remarkable particular, the observing both the Christian and Jewish Sabbaths. In the western parts of Asia, Mahomedism is the prevailing religion; and in the eastern parts, such as India, China, and Japan, the popular religion of Egypt, which was brought to India by Osiris, is predominant. Into India, it appears, that the Egyptians imported their philosophy, as well as their popular religion; for among the Bramins of India the doctrine of the Trinity is an article of faith*. Of the nations of Africa we know so little, that we cannot say what their religion is. And I have only been informed by a negro, who is emancipated; and has embraced the Christian religion, and whom I had an opportunity of seeing in Edinburgh, that, in his nation, they practice circumcision; and also, that they performed an operation upon the women, which is called in Greek *επιτομή*, and which was only practised in Egypt, but not in Judea. So it appears, that this nation of negroes learned the practice of circumcision from the Egyptians. As to the New World on the other side of the Atlantic, all we know with any certainty of the religion of the inhabitants there, is, that the nations of North America have got the knowledge, as I have elsewhere observed†, of one Superior Being,

* Page 292.

† Page 153. and 368.

ing, whom they call the Great Spirit, and in whose name they make their treaties.

And this may suffice for the history of Religion, of which, I think, I have said as much as was proper in a work of this kind. I have also given the history of Arts and Sciences, and likewise of Government; which, together with Religion, comprehend what I call the History of Man, at least in the state of civil society: For, as intelligence is of the essence of man, and that which distinguishes him from other animals on this earth, I consider his history to be that of the operations of his intellectual faculty, which are all guided and directed by the three things I have mentioned, arts and sciences, government and religion; as it is by these that his character, sentiments, manners, customs, and institutions, are produced. As to the various events that have happened in the several nations of this earth, such as wars, conquests, migrations of nations, and revolutions of government, they are the subject of what is commonly called History; but they are no part of what I call the History of Man: Nor, indeed, do I pay much regard to them in reading the histories of particular nations, except in so far as they show the characters of men; for, otherwise considered, they are things which might have happened or not happened, and therefore cannot be the subject of any science.

And here I conclude this volume of Metaphysics, which, though it has run out to a great length, much greater than I expected, does not finish the history of Man. For I have a great deal to add upon the natural life of man, which necessarily preceded his life of civility and arts: Then I am to show the difference betwixt these two lives, and all the evils which arise from the civilised life: And this will naturally lead me to that great question of Metaphysics, with which I propose to conclude this work, concerning the *origin of evil* in this state of man, and how it is to be reconciled with the wisdom and

goodness of God. And, in that part of the work, I hope, I shall be able to show, that all those evils are absolutely necessary, unless the order of nature, and the whole system of man, had been altered; but, that the providence of God has so ordered matters, that good should arise out of evil, which is the greatest work of wisdom; so that man, after all his sufferings in this life, or in another, shall at last enjoy all the happiness of which his nature is capable. And thus, I hope,

I may assert eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men.

Milton's Par. Lost.



APPEN-

A P P E N D I X.

[See page 34. of this Volume.]

PARIS, Friday, 28th March 1765.

“**T**HIS day saw and conversed with Mademoiselle le Blanc (so they called her).—Says that she remembers the country, she came from, is a very cold country, covered with snow a great part of the year, and the nights very long. That the children there are accustomed to the water from the moment of their birth—that they learn to swim as soon as they can walk; and also to climb trees—and that a child of a year old, there, will climb up a tree. That they live in little huts above the water like Beavers; and that they subsist very much by fishing. That she was so much in the use of the water, that, when she came to France, she could not live without it; and, at first, was in use to plunge into it over head and ears, and to dwell in it like an Otter, or any other amphibious animal; and afterwards, when she was restrained from that, she always washed her head and hands. That, though she supposes she was a child only about seven or eight years of age when she was carried away, yet, by that time, she had learned to swim, to fish, to shoot with the bow and arrow, to climb, and to leap from one tree to another like a squirrel. That the people of her country had no clothing but skins, and had no use of fire at all: So that, when she came to France, fire was her abhorrence; and she could not even bear the close air of a room, nor the breaths of people that were near her. That there were another sort of men in her country, who were bigger and stronger men than her people, and all covered with hair; and that these people were at war with her people, and used to eat them when they could catch them. That she had, when she was caught, in a pouch by her side, a club with some characters upon it, which expressed her name, and the

persons to whom she belonged; and this club is in the possession of the heirs of the Comte d'Epinoy. That, young as she was, she had the knowledge of several plants and roots, which were good for the stomach and head, and could cure wounds; and that she fed upon certain roots, which she dug out of the ground with her fingers, and particularly with her thumb, which, by that means, was broader and larger than the thumbs of the people of this country; and when she leapt from one branch of a tree to another, she used to hold by her thumbs, and pitch herself upon them as well as upon her feet. That she could not bear to lie upon any thing that was soft; and that, at first, when she came to France, she used a stone by way of pillow. That when she was taken from her own country, she was at sea in a little round canoe, which children use in that country. In this canoe she was set, and close shut in with some kind of covering that drew close about her; and, when the waves came, she ducked, and let them pass over her. That she was taken and carried to some distant and warm country, where she was sold for a slave; that she was re-embarked with her master to come to this part of the world. That her master wanted to make her work with the needle, at a sort of work which obliged her to crouch and look up; and that he beat her when she would not work; but that her mistress, who, she believes, spoke French, was very kind to her, and would hide her when her master was seeking her to make her work. That the ill usage of her master made her so furious, that they were obliged to chain her, and confine her to the hold, where she made acquaintance with a negro girl older than herself. That, when they came upon the coast somewhere in Europe, the ship being in distress, the crew took to the boat, and she, together with the negro girl, were thrown into the sea to shift for themselves; and they swam ashore, she assisting the negro girl, who could not swim so well, and who was kept above water by taking hold of her foot. That, after she was sold as a slave, she was painted all over black, except her feet, which still remained

remained white; but the negro was black all over. That she could have imitated the singing of any bird, and that imitation was the only kind of music known in her country. That any kind of victuals prepared with fire disagreed with her extremely; and she remembers particularly, that soon after she was caught in Champagne, observing a woman feeding a child with warm milk, she held up her mouth and got a little of it, which affected her so much, that she lay as dead for some time. That any flesh she ate, that was either salted, or prepared with fire, did not digest with her, but turned into bile, by which she was reduced to the last extremity: And the physicians, in order to change her habit, and put French blood into her veins, blooded her, till the blood stopt of itself; by which means, and by her change of diet and manner of life, her health is quite impaired, so that she cannot now perform any of those wonderful feats of agility and strength, which she formerly performed; and she cannot even utter those shrill cries, which used to alarm people so much formerly. She says, that when she was taken in her own country, she had only the little bludgeon above mentioned: But in the country she was carried to, before she came to Europe, she got a longer stick, with three pieces of iron at the end of it; one in the middle sharp and pointed, and the other two, each on the side of it, hooked; and the use she made of it was to stab any wild beast, that attacked her, with the sharp point, and with the hooks to catch the branches of trees, in order to assist her in climbing; and she said it was particularly useful to her in defending her against the bears, when they attempted to follow her up the trees. She says that she remembers the custom of funerals in her country; that the defunct is carried to a place where there is a great deal of snow, where he is set upon his breech in a sort of case, not unlike an easy chair. That his relations approach him with many reverences and prostrations, and the nearest relation makes a speech to him, which she repeats in her own language, importing that he has eyes, ears, hands,

hands, arms, &c. yet is no more, but is gone above to the most high; and then the ceremony is concluded with what she calls *un cri de tristesse*, which is a cry that they also use upon occasion of any danger or distress, and which she remembers to have used upon a particular occasion to the terror and astonishment of the whole neighbourhood. Besides this service of the dead, she has preserved several words and phrases of her language, particularly the name of a little bludgeon, which is *Boutou**; and her longer stick, with the iron upon it, she calls *Tribice*, which is probably a word of the country where she got it. The phrase for wounding one, is *to make him red*, and for killing, *to make him sleep long*; and, by way of salutation, they say, *I see you*. It appears that she must have been some considerable time in the country where she was first landed, after she was taken from her own country; for she says, in that country, she got her *Tribice*, and learned the use of it; and she remembers very well, that she was a long time in the possession of a man who wanted to make her work, and, on that account, as she said before, beat her and treated her very ill; and she remembers very well, that his wife was a handsome tall woman, who was very kind to her, and used to hide her, when her husband was seeking her to make her work. And it was, no doubt, with a view to sell her as a negro slave that they painted her black. That the female negro, that she had with her in the woods of Champagne, she first became acquainted with aboard the ship; that the negroes could not swim very well, but she helped her. The negroes did not speak the language of Mademoiselle le Blanc's country, but had some words of French, and besides seemed to

* This is a word of the Caribbee language, mentioned by Sièur la Beaud in his account of the Caribbees, who has described this weapon, and particularly taken notice of some gravings upon it, by way of ornament, filled up with painting. Of this grav- ing, upon her *Boutou*, this girl spoke much; so that, I think, there can be no doubt, but that she got this weapon among the Caribbees, in one of the Antilles Islands, which certainly was the warm country to which she was brought, after she was taken away from her own.

to have a language of her own, of which Mad. le Blanc remembers a word, *Broutut*, signifying *bread* or *something to eat*. As to her own language, Mad. le Blanc remembers but very few words of it; and what she repeats, as the language of her country, is chiefly French words, spoken in the tone and manner of her own country: From which manner, it would appear, that the language of her country is little better than inarticulate sounds from the throat, in the formation of which the organs of the mouth have very little share. For she told me that she did not move her tongue at all in speaking, and that, when she came to France, she had no use of her tongue, except in swallowing; and her mouth was much less than it is at present, and almost round. And when she laughed, she did not open her mouth as we do, but made a little motion, with her upper lip, and a noise in her throat, by drawing her breath inwards. That when she was in the woods with her companion, she conversed with her by signs, and certain cries, some of which she remembers; and particularly after they had swum the river together, near to Songi, she got first out; and having catched fish, that she thought sufficient for them both, she gave a call to the negress to come to her. That after this a quarrel happened betwixt them about a string of beads, of which, a Gentleman of the name of St Martin, was witness; the same who fired a shot at her in passing the river, but of which she knew nothing at the time. That the Gentleman, upon seeing them come out of the water, and run and leap in the manner they did, was exceedingly frightened, and fell sick of the fright. That, after she had knocked down her companion, and saw her lying bleeding upon the ground, she had compassion upon her, and run, as that Gentleman said, with a velocity that is not to be conceived, and catched a frog, which she put upon her companion's head that she had broke, and tied it on with some threads that she made of the bark of a tree. That she thinks she must have been very young, not above seven or eight years of age, when she was taken from her own country, because

cause she was put into the little round canoe, into which they put children, in order to accustom them to the sea : For they are put into it with a thing like a purse that draws close about their middle, so as to keep the water from coming in, by which means the water might pass over the child, and the canoe might be overturned never so often, but it could not sink ; and, in this way, she says, the children were taught to swim. That she believes she was a considerable time in the country, to which she was first carried, where she learned the use of the *Tribice*, as above mentioned, and likewise to shoot with the bow and arrow. That, after she had escaped from the last ship, in which she was embarked, she remembers that she passed through great tracts of country with her companion ; and she remembers particularly that she was in one country, where she saw a great number of people dancing. That she and her companion lived upon roots, and upon what game they could catch. That what they killed, they sucked the blood of, while it was warm, and eat the flesh immediately. That she remembers they killed a fox, but found the flesh very bad, so that they only sucked the blood. They also caught a hind, and, after having sucked the milk of it, they eat the flesh."

As I thought this Girl, who had been born and bred a savage, and could give so good an account of that state by her speaking the French language, the greatest curiosity I had ever seen, I had many other conversations with her, and learned several other particulars of her manner of life, which I have mentioned in other parts of this work.



F I N I S.